

George Edward Tyler
James Lenex Unger
Thomas Joseph Vernia, Jr.
Edward Erwin Vigee
Albert Louis Villaret
Donald Arthur Vogt
William Walter Von Hausen
Harold Eugene Wakitsch
David Lee Waldron
Nicholas Wallner
Gerald Edward Weinstein
James Carter Welsh
James Taylor Westermeyer
Albert Burton Whittemore
Harris Flanagan Wilson
Milton Edward Leonard Zellmer

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Ralph T. McCauley, AO2241314.
Herbert V. Swindell, AO239590.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical)

Warren W. Gremmel, AO2213670.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (veterinary)

Jack D. Douglas, AO1906457.
James R. Halstead, AO726230.
Robert H. Sterrett, AO1735460.
William H. Watson, Jr., AO960264.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Robert W. Braden, AO2213747.
Francis A. Buckridge, AO2239057.
William E. Burke, AO2239067.
Harry R. Collins, AO967283.
Howard Colon, Jr., AO1546605.
Robert H. Cortner, AO2239633.
Frank H. Dowell, AO2239889.
Richard J. Gabel, AO1863234.
Hollis B. Gray, AO2013991.
Jerome A. Hirsch, AO776556.
James E. March, AO2239629.
George H. McLain, Jr., AO2235587.
John A. Meloy, AO2213784.
Marion H. Mixson, Jr., AO2219301.
Clifford D. Overfelt, Jr., AO2214978.
Arthur H. Perkins, AO1857986.
Maurice R. Seaquist, AO782633.
William D. Tribble, AO2238790.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101 (c) or 102 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be second lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Harriett L. Cavanaugh, AN1912729.
Phyllis M. James, AN2243577.
Patricia A. Thomas, AN2243642.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (women's medical specialist)

May E. Goodrich, AM2240029.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Clifford S. Abrahamson
James H. Aikman
Donald W. Aiken
William T. Atkins

Ethan A. Bergschneel
Kenneth H. McArn
Bobby N. McClain
James N. McCready
Emmett J. McMahon
Russell G. Mills
Marshall A. Montgomery, Jr.
John K. Moser
Claude A. Muncey
Frank L. Munsey
David M. Murane
William E. Newell
Raymond L. Norman
Walter S. Northup
William W. Nunn
Kenneth W. Ohlinger
Leo E. Olesen
James D. Plathe
Thomas N. Pollard
George P. Pribyl
William D. Renner
Earl C. Robbins, Jr.
Frank A. Rowe
Rex C. Sallisberry
James W. Saunders, Jr.
George C. Schuette
Robert P. Schwartz
Charles D. Seymour
Richard N. Snodgrass
Frank A. Sparrow
Forrest D. Sprehe
James G. Taylor
Louis N. Taylor
Johnny L. Therrell
Arthur N. Till, Jr.
Robert E. Todd
Alfred H. Uhalt, Jr.
Wayne E. Whitlatch
Serge T. Winkler
Robert A. Witt

James M. Foley
George P. Gamache
Edward M. Glass
Neal R. Gulbrandson
John S. Hamilton
Guy F. Hellwege
William F. Herdrich
Charles E. Herr
Edward S. Hinton
Jack G. Hoffman
Russell B. Ives
Walter A. Jarrett
James Johnson
John M. Jones
Gerald J. Kaczowski
Robert M. Knodel
Vernon G. Knourek
Robert H. Laney
Francis D. Leonard, Jr.
Robert D. Leonard
Billy C. Love
Clyde L. Luther
Gilbert G. Luton
Charles R. Maddox
Jimmy G. May

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Oscar W. Agre, Jr., AO2219710.
Theodore J. DeSchon, AO2219778.
Richard H. Dietz III, AO2219781.
Paul C. Lawrence, Sr., AO2219873.
Herbert H. McClintock, AO2219897.
Hugh A. Stump, Jr., AO2219975.
Charles W. Uhl, AO2219985.

The following-named distinguished military graduate of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Harry E. Mottley, Jr., AO2250302.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Arnold F. Keller, Jr., associate pastor, Church of Reformation (Lutheran), Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, our Father, in reverence and in humility we come before Thee. We would open our hearts and our minds in this brief moment to Thy great and loving presence.

Thou knowest our duties and our responsibilities. Thou knowest our deci-

sions and the steps that we must take. So, we pray, make us worthy of Thy presence here, that knowing that Thou art with us we may act and live as men and women responsible to Thee.

Our Father, we pray for peace in this world, for men and nations, for the leaders of every country, that Thy will may be done, and that Thy kingdom may come.

Forgive us, each one; cleanse us from sinful things and from evil intents, that we may be led to do the great things that Thou wouldst have us do for Jesus' sake and in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 29, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Minerals and Fuel of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. WELKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Barrett	Douglas	Hennings
Beall	Dworschak	Hickenlooper
Bennett	Ellender	Hill
Bricker	Ferguson	Hoey
Bridges	Flanders	Holland
Bush	Frear	Hunt
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	Ives
Capehart	George	Jackson
Carlson	Gillette	Jenner
Clements	Goldwater	Johnson, Colo.
Cooper	Gore	Johnson, Tex.
Cordon	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Daniel	Griswold	Kilgore
	Hayden	Knowland

Kuchel	Monroney	Smathers
Langer	Morse	Smith, Maine
Lehman	Mundt	Sparkman
Long	Murray	Stennis
Magnuson	Neely	Taft
Malone	Pastore	Thye
Mansfield	Payne	Tobey
Martin	Potter	Watkins
Maybank	Purtell	Welker
McCarran	Robertson	Wiley
McCarthy	Russell	Williams
McClellan	Saltonstall	Young
Millikin	Schoeppel	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I object. The Senate has in effect a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on an amendment after 10 minutes' debate on each side. I shall object to any other matter being taken up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Or for any purpose at all. When the Senate has a unanimous-consent agreement to go ahead with a vote it ought to take that vote first before it takes up any other matter. I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is pending before the Senate, with 10 minutes of debate allowed to the Senator from Oklahoma, and 10 minutes allowed to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], control of which time the Senator from Oregon has transferred to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, briefly I wish to describe the amendment. It would accomplish three objectives.

First of all, it would provide a definite cutoff of quietclaiming title to 3 miles in the open sea, and thus eliminate all the other limits, up to 10½ miles on the west coast of Florida and all along the coast of Texas.

Second, it would provide definite program and pattern for safeguarding the Federal leasing rights for the development of these lands, in which title is not disputed as being in the Federal Government. It would give the go-ahead signal to find out how much oil lies under these submerged lands.

Third, it would earmark all the funds derived from these areas in the marginal sea, to which the Federal Government holds title, for the exclusive use of the retirement of the public debt.

Briefly, I should like to explain my reason for supporting these three provisions which, while they go a little way toward making the joint resolution more acceptable, certainly cannot in the final analysis improve the giveaway features which are contained in the basic principles of the joint resolution before us.

I believe Congress will be endangering our relationships with all other Nations if we extend our boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit. That limit is accepted by international law, and was so testified to by our State Department. Historically, it raises serious questions.

For example, Mr. President, how can we protest against the extension by Russia of its boundary in the Bering Sea, 10½, 12, 15, or 25 miles, if we approve the pattern for such unwarranted, unwise, and dangerous extensions?

Aside from the international dangers which this proposed legislation would stir up, it would create a Pandora's box, whose ills would haunt Congress for many years to come, as other coastal States come forward to try to get for themselves additional submerged lands similar to those so gratuitously bestowed by Congress on the States of Texas and Florida.

I do not know how many Senators there will be from coastal States who will be pressed by their own States to make the attempt, but I predict in future years, particularly if offshore oil or minerals are discovered beyond the 3-mile limit, Members of the Senate will be asked many serious and searching questions as to why they, as Senators—the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from North Carolina, and the Senator from South Carolina, for example—cannot do as well for the people of their sovereign States as the distinguished Senators from the State of Texas did for Texas, or the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was able to do for the State of Florida.

We will see many court tests based on the vague and indefinite and uncertain language in the definition of rights to submerged lands in the open sea.

Other States will claim later on rights beyond the 3-mile limit, in accordance with the limits fixed by the joint resolution, and Senators will be asked by their States to do the same for their States.

Mr. President, I think it would be much better to accept the Supreme Court's decision and protect the interest of the Federal Government to the oil rights for all of the submerged lands in this area.

However, the Senate seems to be determined to give them all away. My amendment would prescribe a definite limit beyond which the States could not go, for the amendment would establish a definite cutoff line at 3 miles in the open sea.

Second, I cannot agree with the distinguished majority leader, nor can I agree with the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that my proposal

and the Anderson bill, which is incorporated in my proposal with respect to the leasing provisions and control of the marginal sea—which no one can say does not belong to the Federal Government—are "half-baked."

I do not believe the distinguished former Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, who studied the subject for years, would submit to the Senate, or that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would do so, a "half-baked" leasing measure.

This subject has been before Congress for many years. In some ways it has always become tangled up in the web of such giveaway legislation as is now pending. Consequently, since 1946, although we have known from the reports of geologists that there is oil out in the area beyond the 3-mile limit, the Federal Government has not been able even to give leasing rights or development rights to oil companies, so that they could explore the area.

We would like to know where in the open or marginal sea the oil is and how much there is. We would like to find that out, particularly in view of the needs of our national security. Furthermore, we would like to know how we may go about solving the difficult engineering problems connected with the process of drilling for the oil.

Each day and each year that passes we are leaving as an unknown quantity, as an unknown equation, these most important details dealing with how we are to recover, through present oil-drilling methods, or by means of those which will be developed and effected through new techniques, the oil for use in our national defense. So the amendment cannot be considered to represent a "half-baked" idea.

Mr. President, I disagree with the senior Senator from Oregon when he asks that we wait until we can dot every "i" and cross every "t," until we can ascertain whether that area is to be under daylight-saving time or under sun time, whether it will be necessary to have traffic lights or not to have traffic lights, and whether we will apply to it the workmen's compensation statute of Texas or that of some other State. The way to proceed is to make a start by granting leases. The other details can be taken care of later. I care not who writes the final bill. There will always be improvements to be made. There will always be a necessity for additional legislation to be passed. Many things will have to be done, as this no man's land is developed. First, however, let us get on with the business of finding out where the oil is, how much there is of it, and how we can produce it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have only 10 minutes. I wish I could yield, but I regret that my time is so limited that I am unable to yield.

It stands to reason that the joint resolution could be vastly improved. For example, leasing provisions were put in the House bill. I am fearful that if we pass the joint resolution to give away the title to this land, we may pass up the opportunity of doing anything by way of leasing during this session and during

the next session, as various States struggle for what they may consider their rights in the marginal sea. Therefore, I say let us get on with the job of producing the oil.

Thirdly, I would say that the majority leader and many Members of his party are worrying about the size of the national debt. It is \$264 billion plus today. We could earmark the money derived from the oil for the retirement of the public debt. All of us know that there will be little chance to raise taxes to a sufficiently high level to retire even a thin dime of the public debt.

The public debt was largely created because of our need to supply ourselves and our allies in our effort to win World War II. That debt is an ever-present danger hanging over our capitalistic system, over our monetary system, and over everything the Senate does.

As oil is discovered and produced in the offshore area and revenues accrue from it, if we do not wish to give the royalties to education—and I supported such an amendment—then I say the next best thing to do is to use them for the retirement of the public debt.

It has been proved in this Chamber that the States of California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida are not in bad financial shape. It would seem to me that, inasmuch as we have a national debt of \$264 billion facing us every 24 hours of the day, these States, with their small State debts, are in a poor position to come to Uncle Sam with a tin cup in hand, and say, "Please help us. Give us the big share of the submerged lands oil revenue."

Mr. President, the first bills which the Democratic Congress passed were relief bills, for the relief of the hungry and homeless, and bills designed to provide economic machinery to restore the productive capacity of the country. The first relief bill to be passed by the Republican 83d Congress will be a relief bill for the tidelands oil States.

So I say, Mr. President, that the \$18 billion spent in the 10-year period beginning in 1933 for the recovery of this country will be far less than what this 83d Congress is giving away so gratuitously to the tideland States. The test of that will be measured by our votes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Florida yield the time to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, this amendment, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, is subject to a point of order. However, I shall not make a point of order, because probably we can dispose of the proposal as well by a vote.

The pending amendment is the same, in substance, as the proposal in the lately deceased Anderson bill, as retailed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which was also voted down. It now comes back here again. The only difference is in the application of the receipts which might be derived from it.

WEAKNESS OF AMENDMENT

This amendment has all the weaknesses of its two predecessors. It would take care of presently existing leases, by a form of ratification, and it provides for further exploration and new leases; but it contains no provision whatever with reference to the necessary house-keeping law which must be provided for the outer Continental Shelf. The amendment presents again a proposal which might well be criticized as being wholly in the interest of the oil operators, and it contains no provision to protect the people who will have to be physically present out on the outer shelf, doing the hard work in connection with the drilling and the handling of the production from oil wells.

The pending amendment is subject to all the criticisms which heretofore have been made with reference to the other two amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. Yes, if I have sufficient time in which to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the Monroney amendment is not deficient in that it does not provide for disposal of the funds coming from this source of income, after the national debt has been paid. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORDON. I may say the amendment has that deficiency also, although at the moment such a contingency would appear remote, to phrase it mildly.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate reject the amendment, and await the reporting of another bill of a proposed title III, which will give the protection which should be provided in the handling and administration of the area.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield, if there remains sufficient time in which I may do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the argument of the Senator from Oregon along that line the same as his argument in respect to the Douglas amendment, namely, that the matter will be taken care of, in effect, when the new bill comes to us, after study?

Mr. CORDON. That is the argument.

I may add that it is necessary that law be enacted for the outer Continental Shelf area. The whole matter will be presented to the Senate in a comprehensive measure, after full consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word, for I spoke yesterday.

This amendment is, in substance, in every way the same as the amendment offered the day before yesterday by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. That amendment was rejected by a substantial vote. The only difference between that amendment and the one now pending is in the method proposed for the disposition of the receipts. The Monroney amendment would apply the receipts to the national debt. It would also limit the seaward boundary of Texas to 3 miles instead of 12 miles. In other respects, it seems to me the amendment deals in a wholly inadequate way with the Continental Shelf problem.

I have said before, and I repeat, that the committee has promised me that it will produce a bill within 2 weeks from the date of the vote on the pending joint resolution; and I promise to bring it before the Senate; so that before we conclude the session we shall have settled the entire matter of the Continental Shelf.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Continental Shelf belongs to the Federal Government, because I believe that is the opinion of all Senators on this side of the aisle, and also of the Senators on the other side of the aisle. I have no question whatever that when that subject is dealt with, that recognition will be the fundamental basis of whatever action may be taken. We have to deal with leases, with criminal liabilities, and with a great many other questions for which the committee has not yet worked out the necessary provisions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to support completely the position taken by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the chairman of the subcommittee, who already has assured the Senate that within 2 weeks after the completion of our action on the pending joint resolution his committee will report effective proposed legislation dealing with the Continental Shelf as a whole outside of State boundaries and containing many provisions which are left out of the Monroney amendment.

I also completely approve the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that many of the Senators on this side of the aisle—in fact, I know of no exception, so far as that is concerned—feel just as does the distinguished majority leader, namely, that in the area outside of the State boundaries any proprietary values which are there belong to the Federal Government; and that in connection with the new bill which is to be reported the Federal Government must be made the dominant and controlling proprietor in any legislative provisions which I would support. I fully approve of the position just stated by the majority leader in that regard.

Mr. President, in concluding on this particular amendment, let me remind the Senate that only 48 hours ago the Senate rejected by an overwhelming vote of 58 to 26 the amendment offered by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which amendment was exactly like the one now pending, which has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], with only one difference, namely, that the distinguished Senator from Illinois in his amendment proposed that the funds be used for defense, during the emergency now existing, and thereafter for education, whereas the pending amendment provides that the funds be applied on the payment of the national debt.

It would be inconceivable to me that the objective stated by the distinguished

Senator from Oklahoma in his amendment, good as it is, would be more appealing to Senators than the one stated in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which was rejected by the overwhelming vote of 58 to 26.

I hope the Senate will not support this ill-considered amendment, which contains no provision covering employer-employee relations, such as employment compensation and workmen's compensation. Furthermore, it contains no provision for the inclusion of basic law of any kind which would be necessary for the governing of this unnamed, unknown, new kind of unit which will be without the States, and yet not in any Territory. Certainly, effective legislation must be enacted before there can be begun in that area business operations which will have any semblance of soundness or in connection with which there will be any semblance of protection of the public and the individuals who will work there, and also of the individuals and the businesses who seek to invest their money there.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I yield the remaining time available to me to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should not like the RECORD to indicate that the pending amendment would provide a carefully considered leasing statute, merely because it happened to be introduced as a bill last year by Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and because the committee reported that proposed statute. I was one of the members of the committee which reported this type of leasing statute last year, along with several other members of the committee who were opposed to the bill, but who felt that we should report it in order that we might have a chance to substitute for it the then Holland bill; and we were then successful in making the substitution on the floor of the Senate. We were not interested in improving the measure, or the mechanics of it, which was then reported, and which was similar to the amendment now pending, because we felt that on the floor the Members of this body would substitute the Holland bill, which the Senate, as we believe wisely, did a year ago.

To point out merely one defect in the Monroney amendment, I ask my colleagues to look at the leasing provision. Under it the Secretary of the Interior may determine the size of the leases. In other words, the Secretary of the Interior would have the power to offer the entire Continental Shelf in just one lease, if he wished to do so.

A few days ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] pointed out, that under the measure passed by the House of Representatives, the leasing units which the Secretary of the Interior would be required to offer to bidders were far too small. On the other hand, this amendment would allow the Secretary of the Interior to offer the entire Continental Shelf in just one bid, with the result that one lessee could obtain control of the production of the entire Continental Shelf.

Obviously, Mr. President, these matters should be studied. I believe the committee will do a good job if it is given an opportunity to study these questions and will bring forward a very carefully considered leasing statute in respect to the Continental Shelf.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—22

Douglas	Jackson	Morse
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Gillette	Kilgore	Neely
Gore	Langer	Pastore
Green	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Tobey
Hennings	Mansfield	
Hill	Monroney	

NAYS—59

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Barrett	George	McClellan
Beall	Goldwater	Millikin
Bennett	Griswold	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Payne
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bush	Hoey	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Hunt	Russell
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Case	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Taft
Dirksen	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Maybank	Young
Flanders	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Eastland	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Smith, N. C.
Byrd	Kefauver	Symington
Chavez	Kennedy	Watkins
Duff	Kerr	Wiley

So Mr. MONRONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the bells rang for the last vote, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and I were in attendance on a hearing by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bell did not ring in the committee room. The Senator from Utah is still at the hearing.

If I had been present when the vote was taken, I would have voted in favor of the Monroney amendment. I desired also to explain the absence of the Senator from Utah.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may now transact such business as is usual during the morning hour, and that any remarks by Senators be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
(S. DOC. NO. 46)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, in the amount of \$24,200, for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1953 which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas at the 1949 session the general assembly adopted Senate Joint Resolution 15, a resolution making application to Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider amendment to the Constitution of the United States to facilitate participation in a world federation; and

"Whereas this action has been interpreted as involving the surrender of the sovereignty of our Nation; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general assembly does hereby rescind said Senate Joint Resolution No. 15 of the 1949 session; and begs leave to withdraw said application now pending before Congress; and be it further

"Resolved—

"1. That the people of the State of Connecticut by a referendum vote in 1948 indicated their approval of strengthening the United Nations to prevent war and the members of their general assembly hereby express their sincere interest in and concern for the effective maintenance of world peace; and

"2. That, with a full appreciation of the existing circumstances and the sincerity and good will which prompted preceding general assemblies to enact the resolutions which in their time appeared desirable, it is the sense of this general assembly that present-day conditions justify a differently stated approach to the problem of maintaining world peace; and

"3. That we favor neither the extreme of an international superstate to which our national sovereignty would be subject nor the extreme of nationalistic isolationism, but holding that in a world of law there can be peace, and that the present best hope for a just and honorable peace lies in the United Nations, we believe that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into an organization of such defined and limited powers as are essential to the enactment and enforcement of world law to prevent aggression and to maintain peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the state of Connecticut hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislature of each State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 25

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the protection of parity prices for agricultural commodities

"Whereas the economic structure of the agricultural industry of the United States depends in large part upon the system of guaranteeing to the producers of agricultural commodities parity prices which are designed to keep the purchasing power of such producers on a level comparable to that of persons in other industries and occupations; and

"Whereas the successful operation of the parity-price provisions is a prerequisite to a sound economy affecting the entire United States; and

"Whereas the importation into the United States of products of a kind covered by the parity-price provisions at prices less than the parity prices fixed for those products threatens to undermine the parity-price

structure and endanger the entire economy of the country; and

"Whereas the harmful effects of importing products of a kind which are subject to parity-price regulations at less than the parity price may be overcome by simply establishing an import duty on such imported products which will bring the ultimate cost thereof into proper relation to the parity prices; and

"Whereas there is now a movement in the Congress of the United States to enact a 'Parity Price Protection Act' which will provide for tariff duties on agricultural commodities of kinds which are subject to parity-price regulations which are imported at prices less than the parity prices in order to equalize the prices at which the domestic and imported products may be sold; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to enact a parity price protection law imposing import duties on agricultural commodities of a kind subject to parity-price regulations in such amounts as will equalize the ultimate cost of such products with the parity price for domestic products of the same kind; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution requesting the United States Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and study relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii and to make an appropriation therefor

"Whereas H. R. 2131 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii,' said act making an appropriation of \$2 million, was passed by the House of Representatives and referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

"Whereas William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development, submitted a report in 1951 recommending a continuing, comprehensive study of water resources of Hawaii; and

"Whereas there is a clear need for the strengthening of the economy of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the development of water resources would provide the means of increasing production of goods and services; and

"Whereas electric power is an expensive item in the economy of the islands; and

"Whereas a study relating to hydroelectric development in the islands would be a great concern to Hawaii and its people; Now, therefore—

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and study relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii, and to report thereon.

"SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States is hereby further respectfully requested to make adequate appropriation to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 3. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 27th day of April A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Consolidated Labor Councils of Solano County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation to give national natural resources to the States; ordered to lie on the table.

JOHN BRANDT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which relates to the late John Brandt, former president of the Land O' Lakes, Inc. The late John Brandt was a great agricultural leader. I know of no man in the United States who has done more in the past three decades for agriculture than he. I am very happy indeed that the Legislature of the State of Minnesota has adopted important concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas death has terminated the life of one of Minnesota's outstanding citizens, John Brandt, former president of the Land O' Lakes, Inc., who, for more than 30 years devoted all his energy toward the improvement of the dairy industry in this and in adjoining States; and

Whereas his honesty, his outstanding ability, and his wholehearted interest in this field brought him national recognition in the dairy industry throughout the length and breadth of the entire United States; and

Whereas at the time of his death he was an officer of, or intimately connected with, nearly every national organization interested in dairying and the welfare of the dairy farmer; and

Whereas the ability of John Brandt in many other fields in our national economy was recognized to such an extent that he was frequently called upon to counsel not only members of our own body, but Members of Congress, and even the President of the United States, as to the needs of agriculture, particularly in our own State and in the great Northwest area; and

Whereas John Brandt was interested in the welfare of his fellowmen, and particularly those who were a part of the dairy industry, to such an extent that he cared little for personal honors and personal recognition, but rather sought the recognition of the State that gave him birth and the industry that he was so vitally a part of; and

Whereas we feel that he would want no monument erected in his memory but would prefer that permanent steps be taken in his memory to aid this industry, improve its methods, seek new uses of its products, and give greater return to the men and women who produce these products; and

Whereas we believe that this object might be accomplished by setting up a memorial fund to be available for research scholarships in the field of production, marketing, and improvement of the dairy industry of our State and of the Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we deplore the departure from this life of so outstanding a citizen of this State and Nation and recommend, in memory of the countless hours and the total energy that he expended on behalf of the people of the State and Nation, we approve the John Brandt Memorial Fund as set up by his friends of Meeker County and supported by his former associates throughout the Nation. The funds of this memorial are to be invested with the University of Minnesota and the income used for research scholarships in the dairy field, with which Mr. Brandt was so closely associated. We urge all interested citizens to support this worthwhile memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of Minnesota in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 16th day of April 1953.

G. H. LEAHY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 17th day of April 1953.

H. Y. TORREY,

Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1739. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 207); and

S. Res. 25. Resolution to investigate means of expanding foreign investments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 208); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1307. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 210); and

S. 1375. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 209).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1063. A bill to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 211).

ACQUISITION OF LAND AND CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report an original bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and I submit a report (No. 212) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1805) to promote the national defense by authorizing the con-

struction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 30, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1801. A bill to authorize requests for appearances before grand juries in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1802. A bill to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 relating to exchange programs under such act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1803. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1804. A bill for the relief of Ben Lipscher, Mrs. Ben Lipscher, and Mike Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1805. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Armed Services, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1806. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., as Lake Umatilla; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Columbia University in the city of New York and providing for the representation of the Government

and people of the United States in the observance of this anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT, RELATING TO EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, relating to exchange programs under such act.

The bill as introduced would amend the so-called Smith-Mundt Act, so as to retain in the Department of State administration of the educational exchange and cultural exchange functions of what is known as Voice of America. There seems to be considerable discussion as to just what is going to happen to the allocation of these particular phases of the program, and a number of Senators feel that educational and cultural exchange should not be involved in anything like propaganda.

The bill (S. 1802) to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, relating to exchange programs under such act, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO SPECIAL REGISTRATION AND INDUCTION OF CERTAIN SPECIALISTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1531) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF MINES ACTIVITIES AT LARAMIE, WYO.—AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a letter from

J. J. Forbes, Director of the Bureau of Mines, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and will be printed; and, without objection, the amendment and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

On page 20, line 5, strike out "\$13,395,-918" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,872,718."

The letter is referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1953.
Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUNT: This is in reply to your telephonic request of April 30, 1953, to Assistant Director Miller for information concerning the Bureau of Mines activities at its station at Laramie, Wyo.

The Bureau maintains facilities at Laramie for two of its programs: the research and bench-scale development on shale-to-oil processes, and part of its research program on petroleum and natural gas. In fiscal year 1953, the Bureau of Mines requested \$476,-800 for the oil-shale research program, and \$137,317 for its petroleum and natural gas program at this station. The Bureau of Mines requested similar appropriations for fiscal year 1954.

The Department of the Interior appropriations bill passed by the House of Representatives reduced the appropriations for the synthetic liquid-fuels program and allowed funds only for research and development work at Bruceton, Pa., and for demonstration work at Rifle, Colo. The funds for the petroleum and natural gas program (\$137,317) requested by the Bureau of Mines were appropriated by the House of Representatives. We have been informed that it will require approximately \$65,000 to maintain the administrative and housekeeping facilities at the Laramie station. The exclusion of the oil-shale program at Laramie from the Bureau's appropriations will make the administrative and housekeeping expenses such a large proportion of the total funds available that it will be an inefficient station to maintain.

The potential returns from money already invested in research and development on shale-to-oil processes have scarcely begun to be realized. Indeed, the oil-shale research laboratory at Laramie, Wyo. (for which an allotment of \$476,800 was requested for the fiscal year 1954), has only recently collected adequate tools and staff for its work. The quality of the returns to be expected during the next few years may be gaged by the results of the high temperature retorting process developed in this laboratory. This process produces from oil shale, in a single step, a highly aromatic low-boiling oil which is a suitable component for aviation gasoline, and contains large amounts of benzene and toluene which are currently in short supply for production of synthetic rubber and a variety of essential chemical products. At present most of the analytical work of the Rifle plant is performed at Laramie where suitable facilities exist. Closing the Laramie laboratory would require that this work be done at considerably more initial expense and delay.

In addition, the Bureau of Mines strongly urges that the research work carried on at the Laramie station on shale-to-oil processes be continued even if the demonstration-scale work at Rifle is brought to a conclusion. The development of new and cheaper processes in the laboratory and in bench-scale equipment for the production of oil from shale is an important part of the Bu-

reau's long-range program in conservation of the Nation's resources.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. FORBES,
Director.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 149, RELATING TO ADMISSION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a continuation of public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 6, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 149, conferring authority on the United States Courts of appeals for the District of Columbia to regulate admission to the bar of the District of Columbia. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at Charlottesville, Va., on April 30, 1953, at exercises commemorating the 150th anniversary of Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Statement prepared by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of the Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, regarding several of the outstanding members of the teaching profession.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Letter addressed by Frank S. Boice, of Arizona, to the Secretary of Agriculture endorsing the Secretary's policies.

By Mr. THYE:

Article by David Lawrence entitled "The Filibuster on Another Foot," published in the Washington Evening Star.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Article by Dorothy Thompson, entitled "Problem: The Liberty of Man."

By Mr. COOPER:

Article entitled "Night Train From Memphis," written by Frank Wesley Ball, and published in the Machinists Monthly Journal of February 1953.

DAY OF NATIONAL DEDICATION HONORING OUR FIGHTING FORCES IN KOREA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post appears an article by Mr. Marquis Childs, entitled "Veterans From Korea—Do We Realize What They Have Achieved?", in which Mr. Childs very appropriately emphasizes the suffering and sacrifice of those who have been fighting in Korea, especially those who have been made prisoners of war.

In recognition of this heroic and tragic circumstance, he urges that a day of national dedication be set aside for the purpose of honoring and paying tribute to them.

I heartily endorse Mr. Childs' proposal that the Nation set aside a day for rededication. I feel that such a day is long overdue—a day on which the American people can pause and reflect upon the dire gravity and true significance of the intolerable world condition by which inevitably we are so seriously affected; "a day of rededication to the faith in freedom for which they gave so much."

I feel that we owe such rededication both to those who are and have been prisoners of war and to all of our countrymen and allies who have made the supreme sacrifice in Korea or who are among the maimed and wounded and incapacitated from Korea's battlefields—whether on land or sea or in the air.

And so I urge that Mr. Childs' proposal be given the consideration to which it is entitled and that proper steps be taken by our Government, by which, through proclamation by the President or otherwise, resulting perhaps from either joint or concurrent resolution or bill itself, a national day for the rededication of the American people may be set aside.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of Mr. Childs' article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS FROM KOREA—DO WE REALIZE WHAT THEY HAVE ACHIEVED?

(By Marquis Childs)

It is time that we ask ourselves how we shall respond to the men who are coming home from the Communist prison camps in North Korea. Even with the utmost effort of the imagination it is impossible to understand what they have been through. With the pain, the discomfort, the squalor, there is something which is perhaps worse than any of these.

That is the sense of the interminable weight of time passing or, rather, refusing to pass as one exists in a vacuum. It is the rot of the hours, the days, the months with no slightest joy of memory or anticipation to mark an eternity of nothingness. Prisoners in the past have succeeded in conveying something of what that endless waiting means.

These men who came back after months, in some instances years, will want to know what we were doing in that interval of waiting. Since this has been a small war, a war fought with only part of our resources, the answer is that most of us have been going about our own business. And a very flourishing business it has been up to now with the Korean war a spur to sustain the economy at a record peak of activity.

So we have had shiny new cars. The highways are crowded with weekend motorists crawling in one continuous stream of traffic. A million tourists are expected to go to Europe this season. Every vacation spot in America is being readied for the rush of the months ahead.

This is America in full prosperity, waging a half-war without any slackening of the flow of goods and services that reaches out to the farthest corners. But will these men out of the long hell of the prison camp understand how we could go so blithely on our own private and prosperous way? That seems to me a fundamental question.

They will have through the armed services the best of physical care. Medical skill of the highest order, rest, proper diet—all this will go far toward repairing the ravages they suffered. Since they are young they can,

most of them, be restored to normal, healthy life.

But something more is due them. We must make sure that they do not take the normal, bright surface of prosperity as a sign of neglect and indifference to what they have endured. Their homecoming should be marked by a day of national dedication—of rededication to the faith in freedom for which they gave so much; a day of prayer and thanksgiving. It should be a day when we could put aside the differences that at times seem to divide us so deeply.

On that day we would do honor to these brave and patient men who suffered so long. But, perhaps just as important, we should ourselves gain a new awareness of what their sacrifice and the sacrifice of the thousands who will not come home has meant.

The defense of Korea was vital to the security of the United States. After all the blunders of all the politicians and all the generals and, for that matter, of practically every one of us, this was the inescapable fact. The first troops rushed in to meet the attack were poorly prepared. From the slackness of garrison duty in Japan they were thrown into battle to meet a well-planned and well-equipped campaign of aggression.

The casualties were fearfully heavy in those first weeks. Through the accident of conscription those first troops were elected to stand up, and stand up they did until reinforcements could be brought from the United States.

Because it is so difficult for most of us to learn that the airplane has dwarfed our world to a fraction of its former size, it is hard to understand how a thin line of Americans spread across a strange and alien battlefield thousands of miles away can mean the security of our homes. In the annals of our American pride were those heroes who stood beside the rude bridge that arched the flood and held back the soldiers of an Old World tyranny in the beginning of our Nation, with the altered geography of our day, Lexington and Concord have had some strange spellings. They may be Pusan or Seoul.

But their meaning is precisely what it was in that other testing time. A day of homage to those to whom we owe so much would be in reality for us at home a privilege. It might help toward a rediscovery of the hard truths on which our free society was established. That is, above all, the truth that freedom is not something that comes for nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the heart of America is gladdened by the return from the Korean prison camps of some of our soldiers. The joyful reunions fill the headlines and there is festivity in the homes of those who have waited so long and so anxiously for their loved ones.

Those who are coming back bring with them the memories of horror—of hopelessness—of suffering—of seemingly endless waiting for relief from bondage. They also bring back with them a terrible question—a question that must be answered.

How shall we respond?

To some, the Korean war has been merely an annoyance—scarcely noticed in the hubbub of American prosperity. Production has been high, jobs have been plentiful, life has been good.

But all this time, a small, but determined, number of Americans has been standing between us and the forces of Communist aggression. Those who are returning now, are the men who have borne the worst horror of that gallant stand.

How shall we respond? How shall we prove worthy of their sacrifice? That is the issue that is tormenting Americans of conscience and sensitivity.

In the true sense, we cannot match the sacrifices that these men have made. No one on the home front can comprehend the full suffering of those who are in battle. When those who have been in battle also go through the spiritual and physical tortures of prison camp life, the problem is beyond solution.

But the eminent commentator Marquis Childs has made a suggestion this morning which I believe is worthy of our most sympathetic consideration. He proposes that we set aside a day of rededication to the freedoms for which these men have fought—a day of prayer and thanksgiving.

He calls upon all Americans to commemorate that day by setting aside the differences which at times seem to divide us so deeply.

Mr. President, we need such a day of rededication to the ideas and ideals of freedom. There can be no better occasion than a day on which we commemorate the sacrifice of those who have fought for those ideals.

We cannot delude ourselves that such an observance alone is payment for the suffering and the misery of the prisoners. But it should be and would be a day in which we express our determination to preserve our freedoms.

The preservation of all which we hold dear is the only payment we can make that is adequate or anywhere near adequate.

It is my earnest hope that the President of the United States will take note of Mr. Childs' suggestion. To proclaim such a day—a day of faith and a day of unity in freedom—would be an act that would receive the wholehearted support of all Americans.

Mr. President, Mr. Childs speaks from the heart and with the eloquence that has placed him in the forefront of America's commentators.

I had intended to ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' article be printed in the RECORD, but, in view of the similar request that has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, which was granted, I shall not do so.

TIME FOR REAL LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY FRANK W. HUSSEY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, recently an important address was delivered by one of the great agriculture leaders of our country, Frank W. Hussey, of Presque Isle, Maine. There is so much food for thought in his address and so much specific evidence that farmers do not want something for nothing, that they want no part of socialized agriculture or dependence upon the Federal Government, that I feel every Member of this body should read a digest of the address. Such a digest was printed in the April 1953 issue of the Maine Potato Growers News. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR REAL LEADERSHIP

(Digest of an address by Frank W. Hussey, president of Maine Potato Growers, Inc., and of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, at the University of Maine Farm and Home Week program March 31)

There is an old story about the Congressman who came home from Washington before his campaign for reelection and started visiting around to scare up votes. He toured his district, meeting as many folks as possible and looking up old friends on whose votes he had always been able to count. One of these old friends was a farmer.

The Congressman drove into the farmer's yard and, after they had exchanged very cordial greetings, the Congressman said: "Fred, you know I'm up for reelection this year."

The farmer looked thoughtful and replied: "Aye."

So the Congressman said: "What is the matter Fred? Aren't you going to vote for me?"

The farmer looked even more thoughtful. "Nope," he said.

The Congressman was upset. He thought Fred's vote was a sure thing, especially after all the favors he'd done for him. He reminded the farmer of some of these favors—how he'd got a job in Washington for Fred's daughter; how he'd spoken to the judge when the farmer's son got in a jam; the RFD route he'd got for Fred's nephew; the time he'd fixed up the farmer's old claim for a veteran's pension. Fred remembered them all.

"Well, then," said the exasperated Congressman, "why in blazes aren't you going to vote for me?"

"Because you ain't done anything for me lately," said the farmer.

Of course that story couldn't have happened in Maine. But it might have happened in any one of the other 47 States. It might have happened because there is a growing tendency for many of us to think that Government's responsibilities toward our citizens embrace just about everything the citizens can't readily and easily do for themselves—or are unwilling to do for themselves.

HOW CAN WE GET OUT?

Let's talk about this situation. How did we get into it? And, more to the point, how can we get out of it?

You'll notice I don't mention things that the citizens cannot do for themselves. There are things that the Government, acting for all of us, must do for all of us. For example, I don't think that anyone would say that defense of the Nation, operation of the postal system, or our public schools, or providing police and fire protection are jobs that we, as individuals, can do for ourselves.

But there are a lot of things we can do for ourselves that we aren't doing—or that we're doing with less and less enthusiasm because we're looking to the Government to do them for us.

Some of the problems we all face are mighty real, and it isn't hard to see why many folks think it would be an awful lot nicer if "they"—meaning government—took care of those problems. I don't blame any businessman or industrialist who thinks life would be a lot more pleasant if he didn't have any competition, or if he never had to deal with a union of his employees. I don't blame any factory worker for thinking he'd find things easier if he had a guaranteed annual wage, or knew in advance that if he got laid off the Government would pay him unemployment benefits as big as the wages he was earning when he was working.

And, believe me, as a farmer, it sometimes seems mighty attractive to dream about

some setup in which I'd be assured at least a break-even price for everything I grow.

SOLVE OWN PROBLEMS

But the minute we turn to Government to solve problems we can really solve ourselves—the minute we begin to lose the spirit of resourcefulness, the willingness to gamble, and the determination to stand on our own two feet that built this great country of ours—at that very minute I say we have taken the first steps down the primrose path toward a society that is not truly free. The world today is filled with the wreckage of societies in which the individual citizens turned their problems over to the Government.

Any abdication by the individual businessman, worker, or farmer of his own personal responsibility for his own destiny and the destiny of his State and Nation is a threat—however small—to the democratic freedom we all cherish. Yet how many of us, while stoutly protesting our unshakable belief in free enterprise, lower taxes, less Government interference, and the like, are day by day acting in direct contradiction to the belief we profess.

Here, it seems to me, is where we must develop more leadership—real leadership, good leadership, forward-looking leadership. What we need is good and true leadership, springing from our towns and cities, from our homes, from our big and small businesses, from our factories, and from our farms.

FALSE LEADERS

There are those who, in the name of progress, talk glibly about turning back the clock. They paint pretty word pictures of the good old days. They make easy promises that if we turn our eyes to the past and don't look the future in the face, everything will be perfect.

These are false leaders. Their counsel is just as dangerous as those who say: "Forget your troubles; the Government will take care of them." The truth is that we cannot turn back the clock, even if we wanted to.

What we need is leaders who are fired by faith in the destiny of this Nation; who will stand up and face the future, not with despair and calls for retreat, but with courage and hope; who will counsel us to square our shoulders, set our jaws, and tackle our problems like men. We need leaders who will urge us to size up a problem, figure out the way best to tackle it, then go ahead and do the job.

LET'S DO THE JOB

Let's be honest with ourselves. The kind of problems I'm talking about—problems we can do something about—are all around us. They're waiting for each of us—as individuals—to roll up our sleeves and pitch in.

Let's not try to pretend the problems don't exist. Let's not leave them to the Government. Let's do the job ourselves. Let's do it now.

INVENTORY LOSS ON LIVESTOCK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, no segment of our agricultural economy has taken a greater loss during the past 12 months than the producers of beef cattle.

The inventory loss on livestock last year was \$4,700,000, and this severe loss in value not only affected the cattle producers and feeders of our Nation, but has had and will have a direct effect on our entire national economy.

Despite this heavy decline in cattle prices, the parity price shows that cattle are at or above parity price. Based on the present formula of figuring parity, this would indicate to the public that since cattle are selling above parity, they are selling at a fair price. Every-

one familiar with cattle feeding knows it costs at least 30 cents a pound to feed cattle and at the present time our operators are taking a terrific loss.

At the present time parity figures are based on an average price of beef from choice cuts to canner cuts.

It occurs to me that the only satisfactory way to establish a parity price for beef would be to figure it on a grade basis. I would urge the Secretary of Agriculture to review the present method of figuring parity based on present-day costs.

Mr. A. G. Pickett, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association, has prepared an excellent statement on beef cattle parity, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEF CATTLE PARITY

(By A. G. Pickett)

Cattle producers have been faced with a critical price and production cost situation for the past several months. So-called cattle parity needs immediate attention. As a matter of fact, it has needed attention for some time.

Producers, as well as the entire industry, took a terrific beating the past 3 years. Consumers were grossly misinformed in regard to cattle and beef prices. The basis for this misinformation and propaganda was the so-called beef cattle parity price. Very few people interested in the industry have concerned themselves with this problem, first because very few understand the problem and second, because a so-called price-support program has never been used in the industry. Most producers were opposed to and are still opposed to Government control and interference.

The spread between a prime and choice grain-fed steer and a cull canner cow is so great that to set a single figure at a point between the two extremes and point to it as a fair price for cattle is ridiculous and most damaging to the industry from a public-relations standpoint. In most grains, and even hogs, the price spread between the top and lower grades is so small that one figure can reasonably well represent a value for the commodity. Over a period of years, figures will show that on the average there hasn't been much profit in the actual feedlot operations, but that gains put on in the feedlot have about paid for the cost of such gains. In general, the feeder's profit has been in a plus-price margin. His finished product must bring more per pound than his feeder animal cost. Using history as a guide then, choice- and prime-fed steers should be bringing at least 30 cents a pound. In my opinion, more feeders at present are experiencing feedlot costs above 30 cents a pound gain than are doing the job for less. On the other hand, canner cows are selling as low as 10 cents a pound. The Department of Agriculture is currently quoting approximately 21 cents a pound as cattle parity. To continually publicize such a relatively low price as being a fair price for all grades of cattle when the consumer's attention is constantly focussed on the highest cattle prices and the most expensive cuts of beef coming from these cattle, makes for the worst kind of public relations. Beef produced from cattle falling under this average, or I believe they refer to it as a composite price, received very little if any attention when we were operating under cattle ceiling prices. Beef that was always referred to, and which caused so much publicity, came from cattle that would have an actual true parity well above this average figure. Why should the Depart-

ment of Agriculture continue to use such a figure that gives a completely false impression of the true situation?

Cattle producers and producer organizations have generally endorsed the present principles adhered to by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. They have approved the program recommended by the producers advisory committee. This committee recommended that the Government purchase American beef so long as they were purchasing commodities for distribution to various agencies and sources. Such a program cannot possibly accomplish what it is intended to accomplish as long as the purchase price must not be more than 90 percent of average parity. To be really effective, such purchases should be made from the grade of beef that is in burdensome supply. It is easy to see that if the law requires that the purchase price be held to 90 percent or less of approximately 21 cents, live weight basis, the price of slaughter cattle will need to decrease even lower than they are at present before any beef from fed cattle could be purchased. We understand the United States Department of Agriculture recently purchased beef at less than 28 cents a pound which would mean 14- to 15-cent cattle on foot. This took beef out of trade channels but might even have a bearish effect on fed cattle that are currently in distress.

CATTLE PARITY SHOULD BE FIGURED ON A GRADE BASIS

Any figure used and purported to be a fair and equitable price for cattle must apply to specific grades of cattle. As mentioned above, this is necessary both from a public relations and consumer's educational standpoint as well as to make any Government-purchase program effective.

I haven't had the time to figure parity on grade basis as of now but an example used back in 1951, when we were pointing out the injustice of a price rollback, will serve as an example. The Bureau of Agriculture Economics, in their publication "Agriculture Prices" dated December 29, 1950, figured out and set up the parity prices by grades as of that date. We are using these figures rather than others, too, because these are the last figures we have seen coming from the Department of Agriculture and therefore should not be questioned.

Cattle parity by grades, December 1950

	Percent
Parity (average figure).....	141
Choice and prime steers.....	108
Good.....	114
Commercial.....	122
Canner cows.....	167
Slaughter bulls.....	149

The figures clearly show how ridiculous it is to point to one price as being fair to all cattle. As long as cattle parity is figured as at present, all grain fed cattle prices will appear to be too high to the uninformed or they will be so low no one can feed. In May 1951 our testimony in opposing price rollbacks using the above Government figure, showed that even the first 10 percent rollback put choice and prime steers below parity even though the price was well above the so-called parity or composite figure. Our calculations that year, assuming parity did not increase, showed that the rollback as proposed by OPS would put prime steers \$3.67 below parity. The entire OPS program was based on this false parity.

HIGH FEED PRICE SUPPORTS

The Government at present is supporting feed grains, protein concentrates, and other feeds at high price levels. These feeds are the ones required to produce finished beef, and the least the Department should do for the beef-cattle industry is to publicize beef-cattle parity prices on a grade basis. These high feed prices are the major feedlot costs and make for a relatively high parity price on these fed-cattle grades. The Govern-

ment is holding a large amount of corn in storage now, some of it 4 years old and spoiling, at a price so high feeders cannot utilize it without taking a loss. This doesn't sound like good economics. We feel that too few have recognized the damage done by bad publicity. Most of this unfavorable advertising has been based on high cattle prices, and they always use the extreme top price for the best fed cattle and compare this figure with parity as now used. This composite or average price in reality is far from true parity for the grade and quality of cattle and beef in question.

This present parity figure applies to stockers and feeder cattle the same as slaughter classes. Why should the Department of Agriculture establish a composite price, so-called parity, which reflects the value of even the doggiest scrub steer and then constantly point a finger at this average price as being a fair price for all producers?

To the public, such misinformation leads the public to believe that the person producing choice quality calves and yearlings is a profiteer.

NEWSPAPER SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is encouraging to note that more and more newspapers are supporting the position of those Senators who have opposed the giveaway of our great offshore oil and gas resources to the three States of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an important editorial entitled "Montana Has Stake in Tidelands," which appeared in the Great Falls Tribune of April 23, 1953.

Let me quote briefly from this far-sighted editorial:

We are not willing to accept contentions of those who favor giving Montana's traditional share of income from these assets to a few States, or the cry of "State rights" as just reason for overriding the decisions of the highest Court in the land. Those decisions established Montana rights, and those of other noncoastal States, to a share in the assets that backers of the tidelands legislation are now seeking to present as a gift to the coastal States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the editorial entitled "Montana Has Stake in Tidelands," from the Great Falls Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA HAS STAKE IN TIDELANDS

Featured this week along with congressional debate on the controversial tidelands legislation is a letter to President Eisenhower from 25 Senators, including MURRAY and MANSFIELD of Montana, asking him whether he supports State claims to boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit.

Claims, contentions, and technicalities in this prolonged controversy over offshore oil lands are numerous and complicated but the main issue seems simple.

In two separate decisions, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that the ownership and control of the lands and assets beyond the low-tide mark rests with the United States. The purpose of the pending legislation is to transfer that ownership and control from the United States to the States from the borders of which the rich oil lands extend.

On a number of occasions in the past, the Tribune has expressed opposition to the so-called tidelands legislation. We are not willing to accept contentions of those who favor giving Montana's traditional share of income from these assets to a few States, or the cry of State rights as just a reason for overriding the decisions of the highest Court in the land. Those decisions established the Montana rights, and those of other noncoastal States, to a share in the assets that backers of the tidelands legislation are now seeking to present as a gift to the coastal States.

Further than that, there have recently sprung up in Congress various moves, closely akin to the tidelands affair, to seek other areas where public domain might be divided or served up to States or private interests. This is a trend against which the entire West, with its vast public domain, should be alert.

IDAHO DEBT FREE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during yesterday's discussion of the tidelands issue on the floor, my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] had placed in the RECORD a table listing the public debt of the States as compiled by the Bureau of the Census. In this table Idaho was listed with an indebtedness of \$1,209,000.

This is disturbing to those of us from Idaho because we are proud that our State government is and has been for some time completely debt free. Idaho is one of the few States in the country without a public debt. The people of my State, regardless of party, do not believe that the State government should live beyond its means. I make this statement now so that the record will be clear and that it should not be further clouded by a statistical confusion arising in the Census Bureau.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 6 OF 1953, RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (H. DOC. NO. 136)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without either side being deprived of its time, a message from the President of the United States on the subject of reorganization of the Department of Defense be laid before the Senate, without having it read, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

If consent shall be granted, then I shall ask for an opportunity to have the message referred to a committee. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and I have agreed upon the committee to which the message should be referred.

I first ask unanimous consent that, without depriving either side of its time, the message be laid before the Senate, and be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from Massachusetts, that the message from the President of the United States be laid before the Senate, and be printed in the RECORD? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, relating to the Department of Defense.

(For text of message from the President, see the RECORD of the proceedings of the House of Representatives of today.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the very able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I have discussed the question as to which committee the reorganization plan should be referred. Under the Reorganization Act, it would be referred to the Committee on Government Operations. However, the Committee on Armed Services has been working on this particular problem for a long time. There are many outstanding experts on the particular question involved who are connected with the Committee on Armed Services. I may say that I have discussed this subject in detail with the able Senator from Massachusetts.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that instead of referring the reorganization plan originally to the Committee on Government Operations, it be first referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and then be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1953, RELATING TO EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON (H. DOC. NO. 135)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1953, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see the RECORD of the proceedings of the House of Representatives of today.)

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, the State of North Carolina went on record several years ago with respect to the subject of the pending Senate joint resolution. The General Assembly of North Carolina in 1949 passed a joint resolution which expressed the sentiment of the State of North Carolina.

In connection with that action the attorney general of North Carolina, Harry McMullan, a very great lawyer, has written a letter in response to my inquiry of him as to how the State of North Carolina now feels about the matter. In his letter of April 16, 1953, he

states the position of himself and of the State of North Carolina, and he sent with his letter a copy of the joint resolution of the general assembly in 1949.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Attorney General McMullan to me, dated April 16, 1953, and the copy of the joint resolution of the North Carolina General Assembly be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Raleigh, N. C., April 16, 1953.
Hon. WILLIS SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILLIS: I have your letter of April 15 in which you state that the tidelands bill will probably be voted on in the Senate some time next week, and that you are wondering to what extent the legislation would affect North Carolina as a State, and that if I have any additional thoughts on the matter and any definite conclusions, you would like for me to pass them on to you.

I am enclosing you a copy of resolution No. 29, which was adopted, I think unanimously, by the 1949 session of the general assembly. In addition to this resolution, the general assembly enacted chapter 1031 of the session laws of 1947, which is codified as G. S. 141-6, and provides as follows:

"1. The constitution of the State of North Carolina, adopted in 1868, having provided in article I, section 31, that the limits and boundaries of the State shall be and remain as they now are, and the eastern limit and boundary of the State of North Carolina on the Atlantic seaboard having always been, since the treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783 and the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, 1 marine league eastward from the Atlantic seashore, measured from the extreme low-water mark, the eastern boundary of the State of North Carolina is hereby declared to be fixed as it has always been at 1 marine league eastward from the seashore of the Atlantic Ocean bordering the State of North Carolina measured from the extreme low-water mark of the Atlantic Ocean seashore aforesaid.

"2. The State of North Carolina shall continue as it always has to exercise jurisdiction over the territory within the littoral waters and ownership of the lands under the same within the boundaries of the State, subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigation within such territorial waters.

"3. The Governor and the attorney general are hereby directed to take all such action as may be found appropriate to defend the jurisdiction of the State over its littoral waters and the ownership of the lands beneath the same."

The resolution adopted by the general assembly cites the specific interests which the State of North Carolina has in the enactment of the legislation with which you are concerned. We have every interest in the matter that every other coastal State has, except at this time there are no known deposits of oil or gas to be found in our coastal area. It is, of course, entirely possible that these deposits will be found at some later time. I am informed that the drillings at Cape Hatteras by the Standard Oil Co. showed the type of sands which were the kind in which oil is generally found. The only reason it was not located at this place was that there was no structure to bring about the impounding of the oil. Of course, no one knows whether or not we will at some later date find oil off of our coast but, entirely apart from this, this State and every other

State has a distinct concern in this legislation.

We have 320 miles of coastline and, as time goes on, we will undoubtedly have important developments which will be affected by the legislation in addition to our present important interests in fishing off of our coast, as set out in the resolution.

But for the action of Congress, I feel quite confident that the Federal authorities will eventually claim the bottoms to all the inland waters, to which they have as much right, in my opinion, as they have in the bottoms of the sea within our historic boundaries of the 3-mile limit.

I have been reading the debates of the Senate with a great deal of interest. I certainly hope that you will make a speech before the debate is over in behalf of State ownership.

I am enclosing you a mimeographed copy of a statement which was made by me on this subject at the previous session of Congress.

I was very glad indeed to know that you had become one of the introducers of the bill in Congress to recognize the States' title and jurisdiction over this area.

I have never been able to understand how the Court could divest the States of this property under the theory that the National Government has the responsibility for war and peace and dealing with foreign nations, which seems to have been the basic theory of the California, Texas, and Louisiana decisions. The National Government has the same degree of responsibility for all the property in all the States, including the farms, mines, and factories throughout the country. I regard the decision as the most destructive one the Supreme Court has rendered of the fundamental rights of States and one which, if carried to its logical conclusion, could practically destroy the functions of usefulness of State government. The decisions were inherently wrong and I hope the correction will be made by Congress.

I am glad to know that the bill passed with such a fine vote from the North Carolina delegation in the House.

With warm personal regards and all good wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

HARRY McMULLAN,
Attorney General.

Joint resolution requesting United States Senators from North Carolina and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from North Carolina to give their support to Federal legislation confirming the title of the several States of the Union to submerged lands within their borders and protecting the title, ownership, and rights of the several States therein

Whereas by chapter 1031 of the session laws of 1947, the General Assembly of North Carolina enacted a statute which declared that the eastern limit and boundary of the State of North Carolina on the Atlantic seaboard, having always been, since the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain in 1783 and the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, 1 marine league eastward from the Atlantic seashore, measured from the extreme low-water mark, and declaring that the said boundary should remain fixed as it always had been, 1 marine league eastward from the seashore of the Atlantic Ocean bordering the State of North Carolina, measured from the extreme low-water mark of the Atlantic Ocean seashore aforesaid, and declaring that this State shall continue, as it always had, to exercise jurisdiction over the territory within the littoral waters and ownership of the lands under the same within the boundaries of the State, subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigation within such territorial waters, and said act further called upon the Governor

and the attorney general to take all such action as might be found appropriate to defend the jurisdiction of the State over its littoral waters and the ownership of the lands beneath the same; and

Whereas the large area of land beneath the inland sounds and tributary streams in eastern North Carolina and the large area of land beneath the ocean and within 1 marine league of the Atlantic seaboard of the North Carolina coast forms an integral and important part of the landed area of this State which is held in trust for the benefit of all the people of the State; and

Whereas the protection of the State's jurisdiction and authority over said land and waters is vital and necessary to the economy of the State, in particular regard to the large fishing interests of the State; and

Whereas the fishing interests of the State could be destroyed by failure to protect the entrance of migratory fish through the several inlets entering into North Carolina waters from the Atlantic Ocean, which the State has always protected by laws against practices which would destroy the entrance of migratory fish into our inland sounds and tributary waters; and

Whereas a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States entitled "*Toomer v. Whitell*" (334 U. S. 385), decided in 1948, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the power of the State to regulate fishing in the marginal sea area within its boundaries may be exercised only "in absence of conflicting Federal claim," basing its decision upon the former case of *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19); and

Whereas the President of the United States has heretofore issued an executive order, authorizing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior to recommend the establishment of zones for Federal regulation and control of fishery resources and fishing activities in those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coast of the United States, and the Department of State, in December 1948, notified coastal State officials that it will begin to put this program into effect; and

Whereas the Federal executive agencies have introduced the time-honored jurisdiction and control of the State of North Carolina over its inland and coastline tidelands, overthrowing more than 150 years of established precedent and legislation enacted by this and other States protecting said waters and exercising jurisdiction thereover: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the United States Senators from North Carolina and Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina be and they hereby are memorialized and requested to lend their active support to legislation which will be considered by the 81st Congress to protect the continued ownership and control by the several States of the lands and resources within and beneath the navigable waters thereof and within the boundaries of the respective States, subject only to constitutionally delegated Federal powers with respect to such areas, and to oppose all pending and proposed legislation in Congress which would create Federal ownership or control of land, fish, or other resources beneath the navigable waters within the State boundaries. That the members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress be requested to give their active support to Federal legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership and jurisdiction over lands and waters within their territorial jurisdiction as heretofore recognized and acknowledged by State and Federal authorities.

SEC. 2. That copy of this resolution shall be transmitted by the Governor to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there is lying on the table an amendment which I propose on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "but shall not be."

On page 19, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "deemed to include."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the words which are sought to be stricken from section 6, at the bottom of page 18 and the top of page 19, would have the certain effect, by design or otherwise, of interfering with the right of the Federal Government to enter upon the beds of navigable rivers for the purpose of carrying out programs of flood control, hydroelectric power development, and reclamation. It seems to me that that is very clear.

Section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 13 reads, in part, as follows:

(a) It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

The next subdivision of section 3 provides, in part, as follows:

(b) (1) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid, except as otherwise reserved herein, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvement, and natural resources.

While it is true that subparagraph (d) of section 3, on page 16, purports to effectuate this grant of title, ownership, and use to the States, nevertheless, in section 6 (a) at the bottom of page 18 and the top of page 19, there is the following language:

(a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

It appears to me to be clear from that language that the Federal Government would not be permitted to enter upon

rivers and navigable streams without procuring in advance consent from the States to do so. Possibly the Federal Government would have to buy the ground on which dams would be built. It seems to me that that would be a very serious matter, because it would be setting aside a policy which this country has followed for many years, namely, of having the Federal Government provide for the development of projects which have been of such great value to our Nation.

These innocent-sounding words, "but shall not be deemed to include," will clearly interfere with and deprive the Federal Government of the power and authority to construct these dams I have mentioned.

If my amendment is adopted, these seven innocent-sounding but treacherous words, "but shall not be deemed to include," would be stricken from the measure.

Mr. President, as amended, the section would then give the States all the essential rights they are asking for; but, at the same time, the United States would not be deprived of any of its rights or authority.

Mr. President, the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have thus far been extremely silent with respect to the meaning of these seven words. The majority report, in its explanation of the measure, merely paraphrases section 6 (a) as a whole. It does not refer to these seven dangerous words specifically or in any manner, either direct or indirect, attempt to explain the purpose behind these words.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in his presentation of this measure on the floor of the Senate on April 1, 1953, did not refer to these words specifically. Nor did he undertake to discuss their import or purpose in any way.

In effect, Mr. President, as I have stated, the retention of these seven treacherous words in section 6 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would strip the Federal Government of its present power under the Constitution to construct dams upon or use any lands beneath navigable waters. It would halt the Government's program for the development of the water resources of the Nation and would stop the construction of multipurpose dams for reclamation, flood control, and the generation of hydroelectric power, which has made the United States the greatest agricultural and industrial power in the world.

Mr. President, the right and authority of the Federal Government to enter upon our navigable rivers for the purposes previously mentioned, is a right fully recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the Government's "great and absolute" power under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

That constitutional power includes the right, as pointed out by the Supreme Court, to use the beds of navigable rivers as sites for the dams and other structures that are needed in furtherance of the multiple-purpose program of water resources development, even though the legal title to such submerged

lands is vested in the States through which the navigable rivers run.

The legal title of the State as owner of the bed of a navigable river is subservient to the right of the Federal Government to use the bed of the stream for structures incident to the exercise by the Government of its power under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have not attempted to explain the effect of these words. While the subject was under discussion during the course of the debate the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], when the question was raised, merely stated that the construction which was suggested would be fantastic. Nevertheless, there is the language, as clear and plain as anyone could expect the English language to be. It expressly excepts the right of the Federal Government to interfere in these matters.

Therefore, in declaring that the Federal Government's power under the commerce clause of the Constitution "shall not hereafter be deemed to include" the right to use the beds of navigable rivers, this measure undertakes to reverse the Supreme Court with respect to well-established law and reject the well-established policy of Federal multiple-purpose programs of water resources development. Obviously, that policy cannot be carried forward unless the Federal Government can use the beds of navigable rivers for the dams and other essential structures.

Several Members of the Senate heretofore have pointed out how dangerous these words could be. On April 20, 1953, the very able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has given much study to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the entire subject of multiple-purpose dams, interpreted these seven dangerous words as follows—and I quote his very words:

The authors of the joint resolution wish to make very clear that they do not expect the Federal Government to build any more dams unless the State itself is willing to sell to the Federal Government the land thus required. The authors of the joint resolution wish to make that matter clear; they wish to pin it down.

Mr. President, the joint resolution is not only a big oil giveaway; it is also a big giveaway to the vested interests and private utilities, including the electric utilities. I can imagine the happiness and the glee that will be manifest around the meeting tables of the private power trusts if this joint resolution, when enacted into law, contains the provision to which I am now referring. On the other hand, I can imagine the sadness that will be manifest and the moisture that will appear in the eyes of the general public when the members of the general public realize what a monstrosity has been inflicted upon them.

On April 25, 1953, the seven dangerous words which we propose to have stricken were again discussed by the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], former dean of the Oregon Law School and an eminent lawyer whose learning in this field is well recognized. Let me quote briefly from the analysis made by the Senator from Oregon:

This resolution, which is supposed to clarify existing rights of the States—which

It does not—is so complex and involved that it places in doubt the right of the United States to proceed with multipurpose and other dams on interior waterways as it has in the past.

No less than 4 separate sections and 8 subsections must be examined to gain an inkling of the threat. I would point out that the resolution is so intent upon giving rights and property away that it is totally deficient in retaining for the people of the United States what is supposedly not given away.

Because of the legal ambiguities and the legal traps and manholes which I believe are to be found in the joint resolution, it may very well be that by means of this measure the Congress will complicate beyond repair the power and irrigation development of the Nation. I am satisfied that such legal ambiguities and legal traps and manholes are to be found in the joint resolution, although I am satisfied they were not intended. Nevertheless, I believe they are there; and, as I have said, I believe that, as a result, the Congress may very well be complicating beyond repair the power and irrigation development of the Nation.

Mr. President, one of the distressing facts about the present debate is that on many occasions the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have refused to answer the criticisms that have been made on the floor of the Senate.

While we have stuck to the issues, Mr. President, they have dodged the issues. While we have asked for explanations, they have refused to give explanations.

While we have tried to carry on in the high tradition of the United States Senate—a thorough debate, they have failed, neglected, and refused to enter wholly into the debate. They have evaded and sidestepped the issues.

Perhaps they are saying to themselves, "We have the votes, so why talk? We have the votes, so why take the time to answer the serious criticisms that are being made?"

It is my hope, Mr. President, that in the discussion of this amendment to strike out the seven dangerous words in subsection 6 (a) the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will take a full part.

Let me hasten to add, Mr. President, that two of the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have already recognized the existence of a problem in subsection 6 (a)—although they have not yet gone so far as to grapple with it in concrete terms.

On April 1, 1953, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] dealt with the subject briefly. When I pointed out the dangers in the language, he characterized my argument as a "fantastic construction." I should greatly have preferred to have had the distinguished Senator discuss the language of the subsection on its merits instead of brushing aside the argument as a "fantastic construction."

Mr. President, on April 1 the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] pointed out that the rights referred to in subsection 6 (a), as stated in the last lines of section 6 (a), are those which "are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

Acting on the suggestion of the Senator from Florida, I have, therefore, made a careful examination of the rights which are given to the States by section 3 of the joint resolution.

Section 3 of the joint resolution clearly and specifically gives the States "the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources." Furthermore, it is very clear that this language refers not only to the offshore lands of the marginal sea but also to the beds of inland navigable streams.

It seems, therefore, abundantly clear that section 3 gives to the States the right to use the beds of navigable inland streams for the construction of dams.

A few pages later section 6 (a) says, in effect, that the rights of the Federal Government "shall not be deemed to include" those rights of use and development which are specifically given to the States in section 3. Section 6 (a), therefore, must be construed as stating that the Federal Government shall not have the right to use the beds of inland navigable streams and that if the Federal Government wants to build a dam, it must go to the States to obtain the privilege of doing so by purchase or otherwise.

On April 20, 1953, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] again discussed this matter briefly. He called the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the existence of subsection 3 (d), which reads as follows:

Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control of the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] disposed of this argument with his customary skill. While recognizing that there is a conflict between the two provisions, he pointed out that—

Inasmuch as section 6 comes last in the legislative proposal, and specifies particularly the matter over which the Federal Government shall have control, therefore, under all the rules of construction, section 6 modifies the previous provision.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on April 25 arrived at the same conclusion. He stated:

It is entirely likely that section 3 (d) will be construed by the courts as adding or detracting little of significance to or from section 6 (a).

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] once again, on April 20, touched lightly upon the fringes of this problem. He suggested, during an interrogation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that section 7 might serve to counterbalance in some way or protect against the damage which would be done by the seven dangerous words in subsection 6 (a).

Section 7 reads as follows:

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251); July 9, 1870

(16 Stat. 217); March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377); June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388); and December 32, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

But section 7 makes no attempt whatsoever to include a complete listing of those major laws in the field of public power which should not be amended, modified, or repealed by Senate Joint Resolution 13. Section 7 does not include any of the following statutes: The Federal Water Power Act of 1920, the Raker Act, the Boulder Canyon Act, the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938.

But someone may gleefully point out that section 7 does list the Reclamation Act. The answer to this contention is that the Reclamation Act itself does not purport to confer upon the Federal Government its right to use the beds of navigable streams for multiple-purpose dams. This right stems from the commerce clause of the Constitution itself and from a long series of Supreme Court decisions specifically interpreting the commerce clause as including the right to use the beds of navigable streams as sites for dams even though the legal title to such submerged lands is vested in the States through which the navigable rivers run. Thus the present language of section 7 provides no defense whatsoever against the 7 dangerous words in subsection 6 (a).

There is no doubt whatsoever, Mr. President, that a large number of Senators who support Senate Joint Resolution 13 would be strongly opposed to the adoption of any legislative language which would require the Federal Government to negotiate with and obtain permission of the States before it could build a dam.

I am hopeful that when they study the amendment we have proposed they will decide to vote in its favor.

A vote on behalf of this amendment will protect against a wrong interpretation which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] believes was not intended by the words written into the measure.

The adoption of this amendment would achieve the objective which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] suggests—I believe erroneously—is already achieved by subsection 3 (d) and by section 7.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there are Members of the Senate who are very sincerely opposed to the construction of multiple-purpose dams by the Federal Government. They would have voted against the Tennessee Valley Authority and against Boulder Dam if they had enjoyed the opportunity. They would probably favor today legislation that would sell these great projects to private enterprise.

I am hopeful that those Senators who would like to halt the construction of any new multiple-purpose dams by the Federal Government will agree to have this subject dealt with in separate legislation.

I am hopeful that those Senators who take this position will realize that it is a travesty upon the legislative process to have such a momentous question re-

solved in a "sleeper" or "joker" provision which has not been the subject of full congressional hearings.

The approval of this amendment, Mr. President, will not in any way interfere with the intentions of those who favor vesting control of the offshore oil lands in the hands of the coastal States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the language I have quoted has the exact effect which is ascribed to it by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. It can have no other effect, because it is as clear as the English language can be made.

I now yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I made my rather long speech—for me—the other day I discussed the question involved in this amendment. In fact, I submitted an amendment which would have eliminated certain other language in addition to that proposed to be stricken out by the Murray-Kefauver-Morse amendment now under discussion. After a conference with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I agreed that I would go along with the substitution of his shorter amendment for mine.

I should like to read the section of the joint resolution to which this amendment refers. To be exceedingly fair about it, as I always try to be, I think there is language in section 6 which might be subject to an interpretation which would avoid the potential danger which we see in the language as it is now written; but in order to remove any doubt about it, in order to make certain that the Court will not be confronted with an ambiguity when it comes to interpreting this language, we suggest this amendment. Let me read the section and comment as I go along. Turning to page 18, starting with line 20, section 6 reads as follows:

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs—

I think the words "national defense" could be subject to the interpretation—and I hope they will be, if our amendment should not be adopted—that by their use the interest of the United States which the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Tennessee, and the junior Senator from Oregon are seeking to make certain will be protected, would be protected. However, I am not sure that that would necessarily follow, because of the language which follows, and which, it seems to me, creates the ambiguity and uncertainty to which we invite the attention of the Senate. The remainder of the language reads as follows:

all of which shall be paramount to, but—

We must watch out for "but" clauses in legislation. Courts are always interested in "but" clauses when they come to interpret legislation. The "but" clause in a bill usually is a stop, look, and listen

sign. It is a warning bell, showing a modification of intent on the part of the Congress of the United States in respect to the language which precedes it. It is usually an indication of an intention to show a modification or an additional intent not covered by the prior language in a bill. So whenever I see a "but" clause in legislation I become very much concerned as to what the court may do in interpreting the legislative intent. And well we might be concerned, particularly in this case, although, let me say, Mr. President, I have no doubt in my mind as to the intent of the sponsors of the joint resolution, because I do not believe they intend to place any sleeper clause in the measure, nor do I believe that the sponsors of the joint resolution have any intention of retaining in it any ambiguous language which might cause difficulty in connection with a court interpretation.

Therefore, my only interest is to be of assistance in clarifying the language of the joint resolution at a point where I believe it needs clarification, and which I believe the Murray-Kefauver-Morse amendment provides.

Let us consider the "but" clause. It reads: "but shall not be deemed to include"—include what?—"proprietary rights of ownership."

I have no objection to that. It is the next "or" clause that gives me concern. It reads: "or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

I believe the best way to summarize and to state my position in support of the amendment is to repeat a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate the other morning, when most of my colleagues were not in the Chamber. It covers my point of view.

A very interesting coincidence has occurred. I am always interested in coincidences. I am confronted with the very pleasant coincidence of having presiding over the Senate at this moment the same distinguished Senator who presided on the morning when I covered this point, namely, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

In that speech on the subject, in referring to this language in the joint resolution, I said the building of multipurpose dams might be imperilled by this language. I went on to say:

But it is possibly imperilled by Senate Joint Resolution 13. The resolution may thwart or delay the fulfillment of this painstakingly developed plan for power for the people. I use this as an illustration of the problem. For other less extensive but important power and irrigation projects may be subjected to similar ambush.

This resolution, which is supposed to clarify existing rights of the States—which it does not—is so complex and involved that it places in doubt the right of the United States to proceed with multipurpose and other dams on interior waterways as it has in the past.

No less than 4 separate sections and 8 subsections must be examined to gain an inkling of the threat. I would point out that

the resolution is so intent upon giving rights and property away that it is possibly totally deficient in retaining for the people of the United States what is supposedly not given away.

This matter is of such great importance that it merits detailed description.

Section 3 (b) "grants" and confirms to the States "lands beneath navigable waters" within the States' boundaries. See section 3 (a).

The phrase "lands beneath navigable waters" is defined in section 2 (a). It relates to land under water in several kinds of areas, two of which are pertinent to this discussion:

First. Land under inland waters.

Second. Submerged lands seaward of coastal States.

As to both classes, section 6 (a) purportedly reserves to the United States "all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control" for the fulfillment of its constitutional powers. But there is a "but" in section 6 (a). It denies to the United States any proprietary rights and the rights of "use" and "development" of the "lands" and "natural resources." Interesting language but I think it is dangerous in its implications.

What does that leave? The proponents of the legislation argue that section 2 (e) excepts "water power, or the use of water for the production of power" from the definition of "natural resources." That does not solve the problem of the ability of the United States to build dams on the land beneath inland waters.

Nothing is said in the joint resolution about the right of the Federal Government to build dams. A dam cannot be suspended in the air. It is necessary to build an extensive foundation, deep in the land under the water. I believe we should clarify the point, and not leave the program in doubt. There should be no question that the Federal Government has the right to build dams and to use the necessary land for that purpose, under its constitutional power over streams, to the extent its constitutional power inheres in such matters, and that it does not have to get the consent of the State to use the land. That is why I am worried, Mr. President, about the implications of the language which we seek to strike out.

I continue to read from my previous remarks:

It simply does not. I think I can read the English language. I think I can interpret it when it is as clear as this, for that land is among that transferred or confirmed to the States the use of which is denied to the United States by the "but" of section 6 (a)—and, of course, what follows it.

We must therefore seek some exception to the prohibitions of section 6 (a) as it applies to land. Suffice it to say that the very limited exceptions of section 2 (f) and section 5 do not meet the problem. A reading of them makes this clear.

Finally, the defenders of the resolution fall back upon section 3 (d), which provides:

"Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any of the rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power."

The question may be asked, Is section 3 (d) the equivalent of the first portion of section 6 (a) up to the "but," or does section 3 (d) modify and lessen the prohibitions of the language after the "but"?

The answer is anything but clear. Both 3 (d) and the first part of 6 (a) use similar words and phrases—"control" for navigation, and "constitutional" and "purposes" in 6 (d), "authority" in 3 (d), "regulation" in 6 (a), and "to regulate" in 3 (d). This is some indication that 3 (d) and the forequarters of 6 (a) are designed to cover the same subject matter.

But 3 (d) states that the joint resolution is not to affect "the use" and "development" of said lands for navigation, flood control, and production of power. Three pages later the authority to do so is quite expressly denied to the United States.

In interpreting a statute, if the novel situation arises of there being ambiguity and confusion with respect to the first part of a statute, and in the latter part of the statute there is contained a specific, clear-cut denial of a power it is elementary that the court follows the specific provision. It ignores the ambiguous provision and takes the specific one.

I respectfully say—this is all I seek to point out—that I think there is danger that a court may be very much confused by the words I have just quoted from various sections of the joint resolution, and that the result will leave in doubt whether the Federal Government, in fact, without State interference, has the right upon a navigable stream to proceed to build a multiple-purpose dam and to use for foundation purposes the land which must be used if the dam is to be built.

I believe we must clarify that matter now, at this point in the debate, so that if possible we can avoid litigation over the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I now proceed with the remarks I made the other night, when I endeavored as best I could to bring out my point of view on this question:

At best, the exemption contained in 3 (d) is of dubious value. It is entirely likely that section 3 (d) will be construed by the courts as adding or detracting little of significance to or from section 6 (a).

I suspect that 6 (a) was originally designed to accomplish 2 major purposes: First, it is possible supposedly to preserve the external sovereignty of the United States and separate it from any right to, control over, or use or development of the minerals under the seaward submerged lands; second, this is an attempt to overcome the Supreme Court's determination in the Texas case that the paramount rights of the United States, which flow from its external sovereignty or international sovereign status, included rights sufficient to make the exercise of property rights by Texas fatally inconsistent.

I suspect that 3 (d), at some earlier time, was originally intended to pertain to dam sites on the inland waters of the States. I refer to Senate Report No. 133, 83d Congress, pages 16 and 17, for a comparison of the joint resolution as introduced and as reported.

With various changes which the bill has undergone, this differentiation has been substantially obliterated. Indeed, the removal of the differentiating language may be taken by a court as an indication of congressional intention to remove the distinction.

A court would have to choose between the alternatives I have already posed. I am sure

that those who hear this discussion will be confused. I doubt that reading this language and puzzling over the proposed statutory provisions will prove easier or more productive of a solution.

The potentialities of this confusion are grave indeed. It may be held by the Supreme Court that the heretofore acknowledged authority of the United States to use stream beds for the base of dams—*U. S. v. Chandler-Dunbar Co.* (229 U. S. 53, 62 (1913)); *U. S. v. Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377, 426 (1940))—has been legislated away or so conditioned as to give a State within whose boundaries the river lies a veto power or other authority which conflicts with presently unencumbered Federal authority—

Or at least to give a State a handle to take hold of, by means of which it can close the door to immediate construction of a dam which has been authorized by the Congress, and can keep the door closed until a long period of litigation had been gone through, in obtaining an interpretation of what the "but" clause in section 6 (a) really means.

Mr. President, I simply plead to have removed the danger of such litigation and the possibility of confusion over language that may be interpreted to be ambiguous. If the intent of the authors of this measure is what I honestly believe their intent to be, namely, to permit the Federal Government to use the land under the streams for the foundation beds for multiple-purpose dams, if we decide to build them, then I see no possible difficulty to be encountered by accepting the Murray-Kefauver-Morse amendment, and I believe it should be accepted. I cannot see how in any way acceptance of the amendment will interfere with what I believe to be the objectives of the authors of the joint resolution.

Early the other morning I read, in the wee hours, from the Chandler case. I shall not take time now to read from it again. At this time I simply ask unanimous consent that the portion of my speech of the other morning, as it appears on page 3842 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where I discussed the Chandler case, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks today.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, April 25, 1953, p. 3842]

Mr. President, I should like to read from the Chandler case. I read from 229th United States Reports, at page 62:

"This title of the owner of fast land upon the shore of a navigable river to the bed of the river is at best a qualified one. It is a title which inheres in the ownership of the shore and, unless reserved or excluded by implication, passed with it as a shadow follows a substance, although capable of distinct ownership. It is subordinate to the public right of navigation and, however helpful in protecting the owner against the acts of third parties, is of no avail against the exercise of the great and absolute power of Congress over the improvement of navigable rivers. That power of use and control comes from the power to regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations. It includes navigation and subjects every navigable river to the control of Congress. All means having some positive relation to the end in view which are not forbidden by

some other provision of the Constitution are admissible. If, in the judgment of Congress, the use of the bottom of the river is proper for the purpose of placing therein structures in aid of navigation, it is not thereby taking private property for a public use, for the owner's title was in its very nature subject to that use in the interest of public navigation. If its judgment be that structures placed in the river and upon such submerged land are an obstruction or hindrance to the proper use of the river for purposes of navigation, it may require their removal and forbid the use of the bed of the river by the owner in any way which, in its judgment, is injurious to the dominant right of navigation. So, also it may permit the construction and maintenance of tunnels under or bridges over the river, and may require the removal of every such structure placed there with or without its license, the element of contract out of the way, which it shall require to be removed or altered as an obstruction to navigation. In *Gilman v. Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713) this Court said:

"Commerce includes navigation. The power to regulate commerce comprehends the control for that purpose, and to the extent, necessary, of all the navigable waters of the United States which are accessible from a State other than those in which they lie. For this purpose they are the public property of the Nation, and subject to all the requisite legislation by Congress. This necessarily includes the power to keep them open and free from any obstruction to their navigation, interposed by the States or otherwise; to remove such obstructions when they exist, and to provide, by such sanctions as they may deem proper, against the occurrence of the evil and for the punishment of offenders. For these purposes, Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the national Constitution, and which have always existed in the Parliament in England.

"It is for Congress to determine when its full power shall be brought into activity, and as to the regulations and sanctions which shall be provided."

"In *Gibson v. United States* (166 U. S. 269) it is said (p. 271):

"All navigable waters are under the control of the United States for the purpose of regulating and improving navigation, and although the title to the shore and submerged soil is in the various States and individual owners under them, it is always subject to the servitude in respect of navigation created in favor of the Federal Government by the Constitution."

Mr. President, is that not a beautiful decision? It is a thrilling analysis. It does not do the proponents of the joint resolution very much good, so far as any strengthening of their legal position or argument is concerned.

The litigation which this legalistic snarl invites may frustrate the expeditious accomplishment of navigation, reclamation, and irrigation projects.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the same speech, I also pointed out that, in my opinion—

If the joint resolution is passed with this language unchanged, the future of multiple-purpose-dams will be placed in jeopardy. I must admit that the morass of verbiage and the crosscurrents of conflicting language make it almost impossible to cure the defects of the joint resolution. A start would be made by eliminating from section 6 (a) all the language which follows the word "affairs," on page 18, in line 25.

Mr. President, that was the amendment I offered early the other morning. I have agreed to modify the amendment by way of accepting at this time the

shorter amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], in which amendment I have joined, and which now seeks to eliminate only the language "but shall not be deemed to include."

As thus amended, the section would read:

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as modified by the amendment we now submit, the section, as I would then interpret it, would simply provide that whatever constitutional powers the Federal Government has over navigational waters remain unimpaired; that no attempt at all to modify them in any way whatsoever is made; and that whatever may be the heretofore established rights of the Federal Government over navigational waters, in respect to the use of land under navigable streams for foundation bottom on which to construct great multiple-purpose dams, remain unchanged.

I think the amendment is consonant with and consistent with the statements made by the sponsors of the joint resolution throughout the course of the debate. The other sections of the joint resolution may clearly show that there is no intention to interfere with the development of water power; but I say that if that is the intent of the sponsors of the joint resolution, and if we are to take them at their word—and we have a right to take them at their word, because they are men of their word—then the language of the amendment we now propose makes crystal clear that there is no attempt to interfere with the use of the land under the navigable streams for the development of the natural resources of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are approaching the end of one of the longer debates in Senate history.

Since the first of April, the attention of the Senate has been directed almost exclusively to this joint resolution.

It has been discussed from every legal and historic aspect. It has been debated thoroughly—not only in this Chamber but in the Nation. No one has been restricted in any way from speaking either his heart or his mind.

Every Senator has had the fullest opportunity to understand every line and comma in this legislation. We will vote in complete comprehension of the issues.

The able statements of my distinguished colleague from Texas—the Honorable PRICE DANIEL—have covered the legal and historic issues thoroughly and well. I associate myself with those arguments and conclusions.

With all due respect to those who oppose this bill, I do not believe they have shaken either the arguments or the conclusions.

I favored passage of this bill in 1946. I was a coauthor of this legislation in the last Congress and spoke for and voted for its passage.

I am a coauthor of the measure before us and have done everything that I can to bring it before the Senate.

I am confident that now the measure will pass—as it should—overwhelmingly.

It is not my purpose to rehash the legal arguments that have been made by the many able lawyers in this body. I do not believe I could add anything to what has been said in that field.

But I would like to take this time to set forth the viewpoint of the average Texan. I do not mean the wealthy oil millionaire or even the wildcatter hoping to make a stake. I do mean the ordinary man who is proud of his Texas heritage and who—because of that heritage—is even more proud of being an American.

As far as Texas is concerned, we are talking about some 2,466,560 acres. These are acres covered by salt water. They represent only a small part of the public domain of our State.

We have in Texas another 169,000,000 acres. They are covered by trees, buildings, streets, roads, pastures, rangeland, rivers, bays, and inland waterways.

To our mind, Mr. President, there is no difference between those acres other than geographical location. The 2,466,560 acres are south of the shoreline. The 169,000,000 acres are north of the shoreline.

But north or south, inshore or offshore, both are part of the public domain of Texas.

They are the lands which we won in our fight for independence from Mexico.

They are the lands which we held as an independent power for 10 years.

They are the lands which were covered under the solemn agreement which brought us into the Union.

There may—or there may not—be significant quantities of oil under those submerged lands. As far as Texans are concerned, that is beside the point.

We have grown into a healthy and flourishing State without the help of tidelands oil. Our economic future does not hinge upon the production that can be expected from our 3-marine-league border.

Should there be significant quantities of oil within our submerged lands, the revenues will continue to go to the schoolchildren of our State. But lack of that oil will not prevent us from growing even more healthy and prosperous.

Nor will it prevent us from caring for our own schoolchildren.

The point which is important is the sanctity of contract.

We Texans believe that we entered the Union under a binding agreement. Our belief is backed by signed documents, by a century of history, by legal decisions which were not questioned until 1947.

That agreement was very simple. It provided that we would retain all unsold lands within our boundaries but would pay the public debt that we had incurred as an independent Republic.

We paid that public debt, Mr. President. We believe we should keep our lands.

It came as a shock to the average Texan when the move was launched to deprive us of the submerged lands. It came as an even greater shock when the Supreme Court—by a 4-to-3 decision—ruled against Texas.

One man decided that case—one member of the Supreme Court.

We do not question the integrity or the ability of those who oppose our stand. But it is difficult for us to see the process under which the submerged lands were taken away as anything other than legalized claim jumping.

It is also a dangerous form of claim jumping.

If we can be deprived of 2,466,560 acres that are seaward, we can be deprived of 169 million acres landward. If the Interior Department decides, after 100 years, that it can reverse its own historic position and take submerged lands, what will prevent a reversal in the future—a reversal that will take lands that are not submerged?

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, passage of this bill is merely the act of upholding solemn agreements. It implies only one precedent—the sanctity of contract.

It means only that the titles to the submerged lands—held by the coastal States for so many years—will be restored and confirmed when the joint resolution introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is passed by Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. President, we of Texas believe that the 2,466,560 acres of submerged lands are our property. We fought for it and our right to it was confirmed by act of Congress and by international agreement. We have enjoyed unchallenged ownership of that land for nearly 100 years. We have set aside its revenues for the education of our children.

These points have been debated and debated thoroughly.

Let me repeat, I have the utmost respect for the integrity and capacity of those who have taken an opposing point of view. But, Mr. President, I believe they are wrong. I also believe they have not been very persuasive to the other Members of this body.

Texas and the coastal States are asking only for that which is their just due.

The opportunity is before us to grant them that just due.

I urge all Members of this body to vote for the Holland joint resolution as a simple question of justice and equity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to take this occasion to express my own very deep and sincere appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for his continued and effective assistance, as well as leadership throughout the 3 years when it has been my responsibility, by selection of the group of Senators who are sponsoring the pending measure, to further its consideration, and, in a sense, to steer its passage through the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas, both in the 82d Congress and in the present Congress, has not only bent his every effort to perfecting the measure, to securing its consideration, and now, I hope, its passage; but he has effectively assisted in matters connected with the determination of strategy, and, as a distinguished Senator representing a great State which is materially interested in the pending legislation, has participated in every proper way to bring about favorable action.

I may say further that in the course of his representation of his great State, I have also noted the unvarying endeavor of the distinguished Senator never to forget that, while he represented that great State, he also represented the Federal Union. I compliment him and congratulate him for the aggressive manner in which he has lived up to both high responsibilities—the responsibility of the serving of his State and its legitimate interests, and even the higher responsibility of serving the Nation, particularly in this Congress, when he has filled so ably the seat of leadership on the minority side of the Senate. I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Florida. I am human, and, of course, am deeply touched by his generous references. I have great respect and great personal affection for the senior Senator from Florida. The people of my State, particularly the school children of my State, owe him a debt of deep gratitude which it will be difficult ever to repay.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield with pleasure to my colleague.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to join in and associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Florida. I, too, want to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, our distinguished minority leader, for the excellent work he has done in connection with the subject matter of the pending measure not only during the present session of the Congress, but throughout the years of his service in the

House and in the Senate, particularly during the time I had the honor to serve the State of Texas as its attorney general.

I compliment the senior Senator from Texas on his excellent address, and again thank him for the way in which he has fought for what he believes to be right for our State and for our Nation.

I should like to ask one question. Yesterday, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], inferred that the two Senators from Texas, through the medium of the pending legislation, were trying to get something special for their State, with respect to 3-league boundaries. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Texas if it is not true that the Texas' 3-league boundary in the Gulf of Mexico existed for 9 years while Texas was an independent republic, and when Texas entered the Union, all of Texas came in—not merely 3 miles along the shore but the entire Republic of Texas, with its then seaward boundaries, came in as a State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the answer to that question is "Yes." The Texas annexation agreement provided:

That Congress doth consent that the territory properly included within and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas.

Mr. President, I have been around this and the other legislative body for some 22 years, and I have never seen a cause more ably presented than has been the cause of the Holland joint resolution. I think we owe great credit to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] who directed the fight. I have never worked with men who had higher ideals or a more cooperative spirit. I am very happy that the Senators from Texas can join in such unity on a measure which means so much to the future of our State and of the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 10 or 15 minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the discussion of the Senator from Texas, but I find it no more persuasive today than I found it at the last session or at the beginning of this session. Therefore, Mr. President, I rise to restate for the record that I think the claims of Texas have absolutely no basis either in law or in sound public policy. The attempt of the Senators from Texas to obtain this giveaway program of billions of dollars worth of oil land belonging to all of the people of the country for the selfish benefit of oil interests in Texas is contrary to the national interest.

I come from a State in which the people probably have more say about their State government than do the people of any other State of the Union, because in my State the people many years ago took the position, by law, that they should be supreme in legislative

matters. So we adopted the great Oregon system of the initiative and referendum.

Mr. President, as to this particular measure I should be very happy to put it to a referendum of the American people, as the answer to the Senator from Texas, whether this measure has any such public support as that which he indicates in the remarks he has made on the floor of the Senate. I am perfectly willing to venture the prediction, with complete satisfaction that the results will prove me correct, that if the American people had a chance to hold a national referendum they would snow under the Holland joint resolution with an avalanche of votes against it. As the days go by, the people of this country are being aroused more and more as to the dangerous nature of this giveaway program.

I spoke in Gary, Ind., last night, Mr. President, and I found in that large meeting in Gary a growing resentment against Congress for its plan to pass the measure. As I said, in the wee hours of the morning recently, the fight on the proposed legislation does not end next Tuesday at 2 o'clock p. m. The fight will go into the 1954 election, and it will be carried against the men standing for election in 1954 who, on the floor of the Senate, next Tuesday, will vote to give away some \$50 billion to \$300 billion of the people's wealth.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas, Mr. President, that when Texas came into the Union, as I said a few days ago, and the Lone Star flag came down and the Stars and Stripes went up, Texas became a part of the whole Nation. She did not become greater in any respect than the whole. As the great Lincoln so clearly expressed, the sovereignty of the American Government is greater than the summation of the sovereignty of the States. Texas has no sovereignty along her coastline greater than the sovereignty of the Federal Government.

When the Senator from Texas says the rights of Texas were decided by one member of the Supreme Court, it is a reminder of the old argument that used to be made by those who were supporting the La Follette bill for an overriding of the decisions of the Supreme Court by a vote of the Congress. The argument was that there were so many 5-to-4 decisions it meant that 1 member of the Supreme Court was greater in the exercise of power than the combined membership of the Congress.

That is a fallacious argument. It does not take into account the nature of the judicial process. Under our divisions of government, Mr. President, the judgment of determining such legal rights in connection with great constitutional questions as are involved in the pending measure was left to the Supreme Court, not to the Congress. This constitutional principle was brought out in the great case of Marbury against Madison, as well as in many treaties on the subject of the power of the Supreme Court. If the constitutional fathers intended that Congress should be supreme over the Supreme Court in regard to the original jurisdiction of the Court, they could have so provided. But they did not so pro-

vide. What they did make clear, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] pointed out, was the jurisdiction of Congress over the appellate powers of the Court, but not over the original jurisdiction of the Court. The case of Marbury against Madison is the answer to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the power to pass judgment on such questions as were raised in the Texas case had been placed in the Supreme Court by the constitutional fathers. That involved the matter of original jurisdiction, as did the Louisiana case and the California case.

When it comes to the question as to the rights of Texas when it came into the Union, the Supreme Court has acted.

What the pending joint resolution is, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out a few days ago, is, in essence, a proposal legislatively to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court which the proponents of the measure do not like.

Mr. President, my reply to the Senator from Texas is that I would be willing to take my chance on a referendum on this measure even in Texas. I think he may live to understand that there is not anywhere the public acclaim for the measure in Texas that he indicated in his speech. There is great division of opinion in Texas with reference to the pending joint resolution. If the Senators from Texas do not think so, let them propose a referendum on it in Texas itself.

Let me say, most respectfully, to the two Senators from Texas, take the bill to the American people by a referendum and see what they say. The nearest we can get to it, of course, since Texas does not have a referendum system as we have in the great State of Oregon, where the people have retained their supreme power over the politicians when it comes to passing judgment upon legislation passed by a State legislature, is to take it to the American people in a national referendum. However, I am satisfied the proponents of this measure would not relish the idea of such a referendum because they know they would take a beating at the hands of the people.

I say, take this issue by referendum to the American people. I am willing to venture the prediction today that if that were to be done, the proponents of the joint resolution would be defeated in a vote across the country by at least 5 to 1, because the people are beginning to see how unsound this \$50 billion to \$300 billion giveaway is from the standpoint of the national welfare and sound public policy.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to point out to the Senator from Oregon that the parliamentary situation is such that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has 75 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has 66 minutes remaining. The Chair believes it was their purpose to yield—

Mr. MORSE. I am not asking the Senators to yield any of that time; I

simply wish to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published, following the remarks I made earlier this afternoon, certain letters and telegrams which I have received, in support of my position on the pending joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letters and telegrams are as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work on that tideland oil deal. You have thousands of friends, don't forget it. We admire you for your intestinal fortitude to stand against the horde of those who just want to be on the winning side. We won't forget you election time, either.

Mrs. ROSE H. FREDERICK.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations your stand Federal control offshore oil.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD GINES.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good fight against the oil grab.

Dr. WIESENTHAL.

HILLSBORO, OREG., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend you for your stand on offshore oil. Keep up the good work.

WASHINGTON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

WETHERSFIELD, CONN., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on a good fight. Hope you and others can keep it up until tidelands bill is defeated.

M. EDWARD CLARK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thirty-five hundred furniture workers, members of Local 76, CIO, wholeheartedly congratulate you on your gallant fight exposing tidelands-oil steal. Fully realize this gigantic steal makes Teapot Dome affair insignificant. We pledge you our full support in your fight for best interests of American people.

JACK HOCHSTADT, Secretary-Treasurer.

VANCEBORO, N. C., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

We appreciate you trying to look out for our interests in the tideland issue. If Russia or some other country makes a grab at this oil, is Florida and Texas going to furnish fleet and men?

FRED WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our 20,000 members congratulate you on your stand against the tidelands-oil grab. Keep up this magnificent fight. The people of this country are all behind you.

LOUIS SIMON,
Manager, Laundry Workers Joint
Board of Greater New York,
ACWA.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your fight against the tidelands oil grab has met with the wholehearted approval of our membership. Keep fighting. We are with you all the way.

MOE MARKOWITZ,
President, Local 328, Laundry Workers
Joint Board of Greater New York,
ACWA.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great feat. We are against giving away America's heritage.

NAT EPSTEIN,
President, Local 327, Laundry Workers
Joint Board of Greater New York,
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of
America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My sincere appreciation for your efforts to combat the offshore oil bill. Whatever the outcome millions of American citizens are grateful to you for your efforts in their interest. And we are very proud of you as an independent representative of us, the people. Please keep up your wonderful work.

VIRGINIA JEWEL.

REDDING, CONN., April 30, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Thanks for your splendid opposition to the big steal. Keep it up.

HELEN and ALLEN HERMES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Am against State ownership of tideland oil. Thank you for your fight.

Mrs. HANS ZINSSER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 26, 1953.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Though we are not residents of Oregon, we take personal pride in your stand for the right of the people in the matter of tidelands oil. Keep it up.

LORENZ and JOSEPHINE HANSEN.

DETROIT, MICH., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Commend you for stand on tidelands oil. Continue fight against this steal.

HENRY SOMMERFELD,
President, Local 254, UAW-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
The membership of our union has instructed me to convey to you their appreciation of your great fight in the Senate to prevent the tidelands oil grab.

MICHAEL J. CARROLL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 93, Ship-
building Workers, CIO.

MISSOULA, MONT., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your splendid fight to preserve the Nation's heritage on the tidelands debate, in which the present administration is trying to hand over to the Wall Street gang, in spite of the Constitution, the law of the land. Please also convey these sentiments to our own senior Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY.

M. J. McDONOUGH.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great feat exposing tideland oil steal, which makes Teapot Dome look very sick.

Sincerely yours,
NICK CAPPADONA,
President, Local No. 2067, United
Steelworkers of America.

EAST DETROIT, MICH.
Congratulations. Bravo.
Mr. and Mrs. RALPH T. VALENTE.

ALBANY, OREG., April 26, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my sincere appreciation to you for your gallant fight against the tidelands-oil bill.

If only we had more men like you in Washington we would not have to worry about our natural resources being given away. In my way of thinking, you have a very fine voting record. Keep up the good work. You have my full support.

Sincerely yours,

JACOB ROHNER.

EUGENE, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I sincerely appreciate your efforts to bring to recognition the factors involved in the tidelands issue.

Although only a part of the confiscation of the public's wealth is represented in this issue, the principle behind your fight is of primary importance.

The market value of title holding in land can only be shown to exist by an overall social investment, giving to such a privilege of title holding on economic advantage. Private title holding gives to the individual privileges of collecting the true earnings of the whole of society.

The failure of our Government to collect its just earnings, and to continue to allow private title holding monopolies to confiscate such earnings, places an ever-increasing burden on the taxpayers of this country.

Federal or State ownership is not the vital question. It is the question of furthering special privilege for the few.

Sincerely,

PAUL BOGEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a letter of thank you for your valiant stand against the tidelands oil bill, from a high-school senior.

Gratefully yours,

KIM DEERING.

DENVER, COLO., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you see, we are not numbered among your constituents, but we wish to congratulate you on the magnificent fight

you are making on behalf of Federal control of resources in the submerged lands off the coastal States.

In the light of decisions of the Supreme Court, it is hard to understand why so many of our Senators and Representatives are eager to betray national interest by turning over valuable properties to a few States for private exploitation. We thank you for your clear thinking and plain speaking.

Cordially yours,

OLIVER T. REEDY,
EVA M. REEDY.

LEEDS, N. DAK., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Although I am not a resident of your State, I want to congratulate you on your stand on tidelands oil.

Sincerely yours,

LEE O. LARSON.

LOWELL, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your splendid efforts to get the oil-grab proper newspaper attention. Even in this part of the country it was buried in the back pages until you so dramatically, and with a great deal of personal sacrifice, have brought it to the front page.

Keep it there through you and your colleagues good offices until you can get the bill tabled for the moment.

I am expressing my sentiments to our Massachusetts Senators by the same mail.

I tip my hat to a courageous, independently thinking great American.

Respectfully yours,

FRED S. HEUMAN.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., April 27, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on tidelands oil. We hope your efforts and those of your friends will be successful.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. G. ROSEKILLY.

UNITED RAILROAD OPERATING
CRAFTS, LOCAL NO. 5,
Watsonville, Calif., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a railroad engineer I have long regarded you as one of our greatest supporters and also one of the most loyal and sincere representatives of the people of the United States of America in Washington, D. C.

You may be sure it was with a great deal of pride that I read the account in our local newspaper of the courageous fight you had made on the floor of the Senate to preserve the tidelands oils for all of the people of the United States.

Senator, believe me when I say that as long as the people are represented in Congress by men like yourself who refuse to sell their souls for gold, the people may be certain that our country will continue to progress for the betterment of all.

Your path in Congress is a rough and rugged one but the memories of your many courageous battles for truth and justice are deeply etched in the hearts of us, the American people.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED K. HARRIS,
President.

ELK CITY, OKLA., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend you for the gallant and heroic effort you are making to defeat the tidelands oil bill. We think this bill will produce a worse scandal than

the Teapot Dome. You are at liberty to use our names if necessary.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. O. O. LYNG,
Mr. and Mrs. OLESON LYNG,
Both of Elk City, Okla.
Mrs. ROSEMARY LYNG KANE,
Moscow, Kans.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations from Local 770, UAW-CIO, on your marathon speech. Your effort in exposing the oil grab will be appreciated and remembered by all right-thinking people.

WILLIAM SHERER,
President, Local 770, UAW-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 29, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to express our indebtedness to you and our appreciation for your efforts at this time in behalf of protecting the tideland oil resources from the grabbiness of certain of our fellow citizens. Your honesty and moral steadfastness at such a time as this is heartening to many such as we—and a great service to the integrity of our national life.

Respectfully and gratefully,

WILLIAM N. HAWLEY.
PATRA S. HAWLEY.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you and thank you on your recent stand regarding the tidelands oil issue. By speaking intelligently on the issue for such a lengthy period you have raised the dignity of the Senate. This surely is not filibustering—a degrading and infantile weapon employed by selfish interest.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I feel that you are a true representative of the American people and of me also.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. K. LANDGRAF.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., April 30, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your fight to save our oil lands.

W. ROBERT MURAPHY.
ROSS COLLIER.
RICHARD GIBBONS.
NATHAN WOOD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I spent 6 hours listening to your fine discussion last Friday night, and want to congratulate you for your earnest plea against the tidelands grab by a few States.

Yours truly,

OLGA V. IRONS.

CONCORD, N. H., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to say "thank you" for the terrific fight you are waging to save the resources that belong to the people for the people. For the life of me, I can't understand why the American public is so apathetic to this situation. However, I have great faith in the American people and when the issues in this fight are crystallized, a day of reckoning will surely

arrive. Let us hope it does not come too late.

In the meantime, thank God we have a man like you, Senator MORSE, to fight for what's right, regardless of special interests or party. Keep up the good work.

Thank you again, Senator, for your great fight on behalf of all the American people.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. BRESLIN.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Please let me add my personal "thank you" for your courageous and gallant stand on the issue foremost in the interests of all of us.

My admiration for your forthright advocacy of what seems to you right, and the assurance that thousands like me are cheered and encouraged to hope for others to be inspired to do as you are now doing.

Sincerely,

SONIA LADOFF,
Teacher of Biology.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to congratulate you on your fight against the tidelands oil bill. We sincerely hope that this bill will not be passed and hope that other men in Congress will show as much courage in fighting it as you have.

Sincerely,

ELSIE WAINFAN.
NATHAN WAINFAN.

OBERLIN, OHIO, April 28, 1953.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note of appreciation for your valiant fight against the tidelands oil bill.

If this bill, passes it will surely be the biggest steal yet made by selfish people, at the expense of generations yet to come.

More power to you and the rest.

Sincerely,

R. P. FOWLER.

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As sincere, honest, grass roots citizens we commend you and urge that you continue your honorable fight against the tidelands oil grab and hope you will help prevent a similar TVA grab. We need men like you. Thank you.

Mrs. J. C. CRAWFORD.

PASADENA, CALIF., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regardless of the outcome of the tidelands bill, I am grateful to you for your efforts to defeat it and for the very real contribution you, Senators ANDERSON and HUMPHREY have made to bring the facts to the attention of the public.

We do need these resources for all the people and I certainly would like to have seen Senator HILL's oil-for-education amendment succeed.

My best wishes to you in general. I liked your TV talk at the time of the election and feel strongly we need people like you in Congress. Godspeed.

Sincerely,

ELINOR ASHKENAZY.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: More power to you. I'm not an advocate of the filibuster method, but I can see it has its good points.

Don't let a few shortsighted, greedy States rob the Federal Government of miles of submerged lands that belong to the people of the United States. Not only would the Nation as a whole suffer, but so would international relations.

What would happen if every nation demanded territorial rights 27 miles out to sea?

Keep up the good work. We need independent, outspoken thinkers like you who aren't afraid to stand up for what they think is right.

Just one warning—don't get a sore throat. You'll need your voice for some more battles.

Sincerely yours,

MARION HERKNESS
(An interested citizen).

THE DALLES, OREG., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your recent stand over the tidelands dispute.

As a voter from the State of Oregon, now completing a tour of military service, you have my earnest support towards the defeat of the tidelands issue.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG J. DUDLEY, Jr.
P. S.—My current address while finishing my service tour is 718 West Yampa, Colorado Springs, Colo.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are wonderful. And you certainly are to be congratulated for your heroic "filibuster" and most heartily thanked.

You are a great comfort to liberals who are heartsick as we watch what is being done by the "grabbers" in even the first quarter of their heyday.

May your long Senate speech save the tidelands for the Nation.

Respectfully yours,

JULIA DUPONT DEMPSTER.

TILLCUM, WASH., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my profound admiration and appreciation of the courageous thing you are doing to give the public facts and information about the vital question of tidelands oil.

Mrs. J. E. ELDER.

NORWICH, CONN., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your new record and deep appreciation for your contribution to the fight against the tidelands giveaway bills.

Do keep up this good work and may you prevail.

Sincerely,

F. P. HALL.

(Professor of economics, University of Oregon, 1929, bachelor of arts; University of Wisconsin, 1945, doctor of philosophy; friend of Ronald Beatty.)

GRANVILLE, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my appreciation of your efforts in making the public aware of the attack by vested interests on natural resources.

As a Republican of nearly 50 years voting record (I voted for Roosevelt in 1904 under challenge in my college town), I deeply regret what I consider the sale of the Republican Party to big business.

I have said several times and hope to say again many times I regard Senator MORSE as more truly Republican than the forces now in control.

Senator KENNEDY licked Mr. Lodge here in Bay State on the tidelands question.

I heard you speak in February and was tempted to visit you in your office just to meet you.

Cordially,

HERMANN G. PATT.

SOUTH DARTMOUTH, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your heroic effort in calling attention to the big steal. There are many who are grateful that we still have representation in the Senate watching out for the country's interests rather than for the interest of a few.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. PETER P. GRAD.

PERU, IND., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I certainly wish to congratulate you on your great stand you took in respect to the tidelands oil bill. If it is possible that in the future the money from the tidelands oil is used for educational purposes, you should be greatly remembered for the record oratory to prevent the selfish interests from getting funds to which they are not entitled.

As badly as schools are needed in this country, I just can't understand why some of our Representatives in the Congress would be so engrossed in politics as not to realize what this means and vote for individual States to become rich from this revenue. I think former President Truman showed that he had the people in general at heart when he signed the Executive order giving the oil revenue to the Armed Forces.

Again, I congratulate you and hope you and the other good Representatives win the battle.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. YEAGER.

WALTHAM, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deepest admiration and appreciation of the strong stand you are putting up against the Holland bill. I was particularly impressed by your 21-hour speech, the idea of which fills me with awe.

Also, I think the Nation is indebted to you for being an independent, for having the courage to stand up for what you believe.

Sincerely yours,

CAROL RICHMAN.

EDISTO ISLAND, S. C., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ordinarily I don't like filibusters but I make an exception in the case of the tidelands oil bill. I think you've performed a valuable public service—and I don't see how you did it.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

ROBERT ARMSTRONG ANDREWS.

EVANSVILLE, IND.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Best wishes to you in your fight on tidelands oil.

Sincerely,

HILDA BRUCH.

APRIL 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This small note is to thank you for your part in the educational debate with the November philanthropists on the tidelands issue.

Many thanks for your honest participation and may God bless you for the sincere stand you have taken.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BURKE.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO., April 21, 1953.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We fully appreciate the wonderful fight you are making against the oil steal and sincerely hope that you will win.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT WERTZ.

WHEATRIDGE, COLO., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is most heartening to know that you and your colleagues are doing such a magnificent job protecting the rights of all the people of the United States in the tideland battle.

Thank you very much. Please keep it up. We are with you all the way.

Sincerely,

W. E. PAGE.

P. S.—How can I help besides talking and writing to my friends?

WEST HARTFORD, CONN., April 28, 1953.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The enclosed clipping may contain some ammunition for your splendid fight against the giveaway of the birthright of the American people.

As a registered Republican of many years standing, may I say that the Republican Party is acting in this matter in a way that will, I fear, react strongly against it in future elections. When the voters of the 45 States awake to the fact that the party, through its majority in Congress and through the administration, has acted in a manner that will make the Teapot Dome scandal look like a tempest in a teapot, the result may well be fatal to its chances of maintaining its majority. Many other independent Republicans around here feel as I do. I am glad that there are a few in Congress like yourself, who are farsighted enough to take the right position, regardless of party affiliation.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. DADOURIAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senator of the United States,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to reiterate once again that you are doing a magnificent job as a defender of the public trust. Your stand on the issue of tidelands oil is most commendable.

I have watched your progress in the Senate in the last few months and want to assure you that you are fostering the cause of the liberal-independent movement despite the heartaches that accompany your position in the Senate.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS ZILL.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to extend my sincere congratulations for the valiant fight you are participating in on behalf of the entire American people.

It gives heart to right-thinking Americans to know that there are those in Congress who are actively concerned with their welfare and are willing to fight for it.

I am, at the same time, writing my Senator who is for the giveaway and urging him to see the light and act for all the people of this country.

Your efforts and courage are appreciated and I am hopeful others will come to your

aid to make this program of action for all the people a complete success.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT S. EIGES.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to congratulate you on your forthright stand in protecting the interests of the people and the natural resources of the United States. We believe in and hope you continue your fight for all Americans. As a result of your lengthy speech for Government possession of the tidelands we have written the two Senators from Michigan and urged them to vote in the same manner.

Yours truly,

MYRNA and AUBREY DIEM,
Class of 1953, Wayne University.

HUNTINGTON WOODS, MICH.,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your splendid effort to save the marginal seas oil deposits for all the people. If we had more men of your caliber we could make democracy live.

Thanks again.

H. JOHN SHEPPARD.

MIAMI, FLA., April 26, 1953.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to write this letter commending you on your recent speech in the Senate opposing the tidelands oil bill giving away public resources belonging to all of the people to four States.

It may be interesting to know that by your speech you were able to crash the iron curtain of the press in this area. Strong indication of this iron curtain was dramatically pointed out by the professor of my Government class at the University of Miami, Miami, Fla. (I am a student attending under provisions of the Korean GI bill.) During a recent class, slips of paper were handed out to the students with the following question: "For 15 days the Senate has been debating one vital issue. What does this concern?" If an answer was given you were asked on the paper by what media you obtained the information. In my class of approximately 50 students, only 1 student knew the issue being debated. Press "iron curtain?"

I saw you on your appearance on the Kate Smith television program and it was certainly unnecessary for you to have to assert your beliefs on how a Senator should vote on public issues and whom he should represent. Your record speaks for itself.

It is reassuring to me, especially in the present Congress, to know that able, honest men such as yourself, Senator HUMPHREY, and the Senator from my home State, Senator KEFAUVER, are alert to protect the interests of the general public.

Respectfully,

MELVIN KASET.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to congratulate and thank you for the wonderful job you have done and are doing fighting the big oil giveaway.

The people of Oregon can be very proud of you. Many of us in Michigan wish you were our Senator.

Very truly yours,

WM. BOZELL.

NORTH FOND DU LAC, WIS., April 25, 1953.

Senator W. MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just a line to let you know we appreciate your efforts for the people to keep the offshore oil and other resources in the control of the National Government.

It is good to know we have some sensible representatives in Congress, even if we have forgotten how to elect that kind in Wisconsin.

Yours truly,

B. C. BUSHEE.

BAY RIDGE COMMUNITY COUNCIL,

Brooklyn, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My deepest thanks and appreciation to you for your gallant and courageous fight against the tidelands oil grab.

May you have the health and the strength to carry on your campaign in the interests of the American people.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT P. KASSENBRICK.

Arlington, Mass., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While I am not one of your constituents, I have nevertheless felt for some time a strong urge to let you know how grateful I am for the position that you have been taking, both in and out of Congress. Your actions on the tidelands oil issue, your stand with regard to McCARTHY, your refusal to allow the term loyal opposition to take on the meaning of unquestioning loyalty without opposition, your courageous stand in the last election, all of these and more have made you deserving of the gratitude and support of those of us who still regard the liberal position as the world's best hope.

It is my hope that your fine example may, in time, bring out the same in some of your timorous colleagues. In the meantime, knowing full well that your stand may turn out to be politically costly in the immediate future (although not, I hope, in the long run), I fervently hope that you will continue to lead the struggle against the reactionary forces.

Sincerely yours,

B. T. FELD.

NORTH BRANCH, N. J., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate your very great effort in trying to save the offshore oil deposits for the benefit of all the people of this country.

Our sincere thanks and very best wishes.

Very truly yours,

ANNA E. RHODES.

ISAAC C. RHODES.

CHARLEVOIX, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I heartily commend you and your fellow Senators for the valiant battle that you are waging against the group that is about to plunder our national treasure in this tideland oil affair.

Sincerely hope that you are successful.

Respectfully yours,

THAD J. NOWAKOWSKI.

MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: We don't know exactly how or what to say to you, but we would like you to know that our hearts are warmer and our minds freer, for your gallant stand against the tidelands oil bill. I'll just bet the soul of Harold Ickes is applauding your courage and forthrightness.

My husband and I are behind you all of the way, be of good cheer and may God bless you and yours.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. RAYMOND K. ETIENE.

MUNCIE, IND., April 28, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I extend my personal appreciation and thanks for your efforts in behalf of Federal control of tidal oil areas? My only regret is that so few of your colleagues seem inclined to put the needs of so many millions of American boys and girls ahead of selfishness, of greedy grasping for personal wealth.

For 12 years, I have watched a steadily increasing birth rate putting an impossible strain on a school system already weakened so far as buildings were concerned by a depression and a war. I have watched continuing low salaries force good teachers and good teacher prospects into other, more "profitable" occupations. I'm proud of my own locality, which is building new schools as rapidly as it can—and I know others are doing good jobs in that direction. But not nearly enough—and as you know, many millions of American boys and girls are attending school now for half-days or less, in every imaginable sort of unsuitable building.

The wisdom of our Founding Fathers, who assigned lands for the support of public education in the early years of our Republic, has long been praised. Our Senators and Congressmen, at any time in the past 6 or 8 years at least, could have acted with the same wisdom, foresight, and faith in the future of an educated America. Instead, a majority of them has chosen to ignore, time after time, the possibility of providing for education through tidal oil revenue; the possibility of assuring a better future for our Nation through better provision for her children by that means; the possibility that catering to greed and personal selfishness can cost the Nation dearly in the years ahead.

I can't see anywhere the amount of money which has been needed for the past 6 years or more to build schools and train more teachers, except in that tidal oil income—there just isn't any such sum available anywhere else. It doesn't make sense that so few Senators and Congressmen chose to see their own obligation toward this national emergency.

Again, thank you for your wonderful effort.
Sincerely,

EDNA REED.

Mrs. Charles R. Reed.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courageous stand against the passage of the tidelands oil measure.

I am enclosing a copy of letter I am sending to Senator CORDON outlining my views on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY F. ADAM.

BROADWAY-EAST

BALTIMORE METHODIST PARISH,
Baltimore, Md., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My thanks for your extraordinary efforts against the tidelands bill. You have done us all a service. Now it is up to us to respond to your call for action.

I am writing my Senators, and will do all I can here in Baltimore.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD HAM.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Three cheers for your long and I hope rewarding speech. You are doing the country a service and we are very grateful to you. I have written to my Senators and have been trying to get my friends to do the same. I do hope that the tidelands oil bill will be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. P. M. LEIGHTON.

GALION, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We commend you on your stand on the tidelands bill.

We wish you were a Senator from Ohio.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. L. A. LORENS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I would like to express our appreciation of the tremendous efforts you are making in the tideland's oil issue.

Sincerely,

AGNES LANYAN POWER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Just a note of appreciation to a Senator that I believe truly represents me much better than I could for myself. I don't always agree with everything that you do but I certainly thank God we of Oregon have a man of your intelligence and courage to do what you do do.

I like your actions on the deliberate steal of our tidelands and I feel sure that the power interests will not steal without a fight the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries.

Sincerely,

WM. CADY.

EUGENE, OREG., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heartily endorse your heroic stand on submerged oils bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT LEEPOR.

EDDYVILLE, OREG., April 27, 1953.

EDITOR OF THE OREGON JOURNAL,
The Oregon Journal,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Oregon's great Senator MORSE should be congratulated for his vigorous fight in Congress against the oil grab and all planned raids on the public domain.

If filibustering is to remain a congressional device, it is hard to see why its use should be limited to the purposes of those who are working against the general public interest. It is also hard to see why liberals, when they have to, cannot use the filibuster as successfully as their opponents.

As a means of communication and public enlightenment becomes concentrated more and more in the hands of a few great chains, owned and controlled by powerful financial interests, liberals may find the filibuster one of the few ways left to them to carry their message to the people.

Yours truly,

H. R. GLASCOCK, Sr.

ASTORIA, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We appreciate the fight you are putting up against the tidelands oil bill. While I have never favored a filibuster, I must admit that I am enjoying this one to the fullest extent.

Why some of our Senators want to take all this money away from our schools, is

more than I can understand. The press is not telling their readers how much money our schools would lose through royalties if this tideland bill passes.

The Oregonian is playing down your speech as usual. A lot of people probably take the press and believe every word they read in it. But I cannot believe they are fooling the rank and file of their readers. Let us hope they don't, anyway.

The State farmers union has an article in the Oregonian this morning commending you on your speech, and urging everyone to write Senator CORDON and President Eisenhower urging support for the Hill-Anderson bill. We are with you even if we don't always write and tell you about it.

Yours very truly,

F. E. BROOKS.

FOREST GROVE, OREG., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my appreciation for your tireless efforts in defense of Federal ownership of tidelands oil. I am sure that no matter what the outcome of the final vote on this issue, thinking men in years to come will agree that your unwillingness to give up was right, upholding not only the interest of the citizens of Oregon but of the entire Nation. Please accept my congratulations and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER B. NEUBURG, Jr.

ROCKFORD, ILL., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your outspoken actions for the good of our country, and especially on the tidelands giveaway bill.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES P. CURRY.

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE
FIREMEN AND ENGINEERS,
CALUMET LODGE No. 870,
Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations upon your new record. A record that every liberal American can well be proud. All we ask is that for the records that Americans such as you will be retained forever, to fight and retain the rights of all Americans what is theirs. Keep up the wonderful fight against the tidelands oil grab, every thinking American is back of you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. DUGGAN.

MEMPHIS, TENN., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your lengthy talkathon on tidelands was remarkable, and I wish to congratulate you on the fight that you and your colleagues are putting up to keep tidelands oil out of the hands of the oil syndicates. I am opposed to turning tidelands over to the States as are many other American citizens because such offshore oil should rightfully belong to the people, as the United States Supreme Court ruled it as such. You are doing a fine job for the American people, Senator MORSE; keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

HOMER J. LARKIN.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you for your valiant efforts to bring the oil-giveaway program to the attention of the American people. It was not until the end of last week that we began to see anything about this bill in our Seattle papers.

I feel that the efforts of yourself and Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and others are deeply appreciated by the American people who look to the future of this great country.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ROBERT L. HORN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my thanks for your wonderful effort of this past weekend.

There can be no doubt of the correctness of your position. The offshore lands involved belong to all of the United States as the Supreme Court has repeatedly stated, and to convey them to only three of the States cannot be justified on any moral basis.

Again my thanks.

Very truly yours,

DAVID Z. ROSENSWEIG.

OFFICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Portland, Oreg., April 28, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to add my expression of approval to the many others I know you have received on your action late last week in focusing attention on the offshore-oil steal being pushed in Congress by selfish interests.

You and I have no difference of opinion on this unprincipled proposal. I only wish that more Members of the Congress had the same sense of fair play and integrity which you have displayed, not only on this matter but on many others which have been of direct vital concern to the small people of the country.

If the offshore-oil steal succeeds, it is only one more step to the abrogating of existing replanting and conservation measures in the lumber, fishing, and other industries which are also part of our natural and inherent resources.

I commend you for the fight you are making in behalf of the overwhelming majority of the people of our country.

Very truly yours,

J. HOWARD HICKS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

APRIL 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is heartening to know that individuals within our legislative body of the Senate have created in the name of the American public the forceful opposition to the controversial tidelands bill.

Your personal interest and effort, as of all your fellow Senators, is well taken and appreciated by a portion of the American public.

Contrary to the voiced opinions of some of the proposal's backers, their press and radio segments, it is my belief that a greater portion of the American public to this late date is not cognizant of the bill's proposals.

With our educational system in dire need of improved school systems and a greater number of teachers, it seems to me that the income derived from a national resource and used for the improvement of our educational

system would not be lightly passed nor overlooked by the great majority of the American public.

I, therefore, voice my approval to the stand of opposition engendered by your group and yourself. Through such opposition and delaying action, the American public will awaken to their interests in this political reward to partisan sectionalism.

Cordially yours,

JOHN M. RYAN.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Here is just a few words of thanks for all you have done for America.

I believe I am only one of millions of Americans which greatly admire you for your courage and political honesty. You had the courage to support Mr. Stevenson in the last election, and even in his defeat, you still remained loyal to the best man. There are not many men who would bolt his party in the interest of the average American and his welfare. Please continue your good work. You are a real American.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD N. BREEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express our appreciation of the wonderful fight you have made for the interests of all the people in the so-called tidelands oil case. It is unfortunate that we do not have more Senators like you.

Respectfully,

M. M. ANDERSEN.

MISSION, KANS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for your very gallant fight to stop the oil grab. If they do finally win they will know that they have been places. I have written the two Senators and the Representative from my State—Kansas—asking them to vote against this bill and called attention to the fact that this would not mean returning these lands to the three States involved for the simple fact that they had never possessed them in the first place. Perhaps the GOP thinks this is the 30 shekels of silver that they are required to pay for electoral votes. Wishing you success.

Yours sincerely,

F. H. LILLY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: We the people of Tennessee are behind you in your fight against the submerged offshore-land bill. Do all you can to help KEFAUVER to defend TVA service against selfish power interests. We admire your courage and ability to stand for what is best for the people.

Mrs. C. C. PRYOR.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Unfortunately, I was absent from the office last Saturday when some of my colleagues here sent you a wire applauding your courageous stand against the tidelands issue. May I, however, add a hearty amen.

I am continually impressed with the potential value of the current approach both by yourself and those colleagues who share your point of view. If the public can be alerted,

all will not be lost as other similar issues are presented for legislative action.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

A. L. THURMAN, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to congratulate you on the courageous fight you are waging against the tidelands giveaway. If only the people would wake up to the evils that will flow from passage of this nefarious measure. Our entire natural resources are in grave danger if this bill passes.

Incidentally, the undersigned is also a graduate of the University of Minnesota Law School and has watched your career in the Senate with more than usual interest. You are doing splendid work. More power to you.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT G. SHARE.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 27, 1953.

Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My sincerest thanks to you and the other Senators who are fighting the so-called tidelands bill. I think this is the most brazen fraud ever attempted against the American people. It is also, it seems to me, a dangerous precedent for the executive and legislative divisions to usurp what is clearly judicial.

The whole scheme has been to deceive and confuse. Tidelands oil belongs to the States and has never been involved in this dispute. Why use this title instead of a correct one? This morning's paper (Hearst) speaks of "restoring" ownership to the States. It was shrewd to get this tangled in an emotional presidential campaign. Last November people voted for a President, not oil. One can be a good Republican and still object to being swindled. This isn't a political party question but one of the ownership of very valuable property which the only authority qualified to decide, the Supreme Court, has ruled belongs to the people of the United States, or rather does not belong to the coastal States.

I look for defeat now, but will it be possible for the Congress to undo this wrong? I can't believe that the voters, especially the taxpayers, have really understood what is at stake. I can't believe that the American people are so dumb as knowingly to give away, with no compensation, a property not only valuable but vital to our prosperity and defense. I hope that the people will be educated and the fight go on.

Respectfully,

MARGARET F. COOK.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your heroic struggle in the matter of the tideland oil. We need men like you and I hope there will be enough of them around to prevent this intended steal from the people of this land. Again, congratulations to your fight.

Yours very respectfully,

JOHN H. BLAINE.

MEDFORD, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have never been prouder of you than after reading the account in yesterday's Medford Mail Tribune of your record-breaking 22-hour and 26-minute speech in the Senate against the tidelands oil bill. If this be filibustering, then

we assert that it has never been used in a worthier cause.

We are just ordinary Oregon voters, my husband and I, with children going to school, this last being one big reason why we favor so strongly the Hill-Anderson measure.

We have wanted to write to you at least a dozen times in the past few months to tell you how much we appreciate the stand you have taken on various issues. We're just bursting with pride over you, for we feel that you are the finest example of what a politician should be, rather than what most of them actually are. You have shown that politics can be a noble profession and not a dirty business. Your example will be an inspiration to a generation of oncoming politicians of integrity.

Thank you, Senator MORSE. We pray that you will never waver or weaken in your fight for the best interests of all the people.

Sincerely,

ARDATH AUEL.
WILLIAM AUEL.

MEDFORD, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have written both Mr. CORDON and Mr. TAFT protesting the giving away of the tidelands though I don't suppose it will do much good. I did suggest to both that the benefits accruing to Texas and California from a Republican administration should be great enough to pay for their supporting Mr. Eisenhower without robbing the general public to pay them. Also I suggest that it might be a good idea to have a general election to see if there was public support for this plan.

Very truly,

FLORENCE DEAN.
Mrs. George B. Dean.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to offer my congratulations for the notable work you have done in informing the American public on the tidelands-oil issue.

As one who believes firmly that the revenues from these lands should be used for public good rather than for private profit. I have been encouraged and inspired by your leadership. The lengthy speech you have just concluded is a magnificent example of political courage and integrity.

There are those who think you have harmed or are harming your political future. I cannot believe this view will prevail in the long run, for on this issue you have given a clear demonstration of your devotion to the highest ideals of public service.

Again, my sincere congratulations. Like so many of your supporters, I feel as if I owe you a personal debt of gratitude for your splendid work.

Yours most sincerely,

STANLEY JOHNSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am thrilled at your triumph in preventing the steal of the offshore oil lands and deeply grateful as a citizen. I stand in admiration of the integrity which you so forcefully and brilliantly displayed. Men many long days in the future will look upon this feat with awe and admiration.

With very best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

FRANK W. GLOSTER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senator of Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to congratulate you on your speech on the Senate floor

in regards to the tidelands oil bill (or is it submerged-land bill?) and on your fight to bring this big giveaway to the attention of the American people.

I've written to both Missouri Senators, SYMINGTON and HENNING, who are, I believe of the same opinion as you on this legislation.

The people are certainly against this steal, but are not taking the time to write to their representatives as they should.

We get good coverage of the news here from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. We are lucky, I suppose, from what you and other people have said about some of the newspapers throughout the country.

Your position on other legislation has always been for the best interest of the people of the United States (not to any one State).

Please continue as you have done in the past. God bless you, Mr. Senator.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. STEPHENS.

VAN DYKE, MICH., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: We respect you for the courageous fight you are making against the tidelands oil grab.

Mr. and Mrs. CHESTER KAYNE.

BURLINGTON, MASS. April 27, 1953.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I want to thank you for the gallant fight you waged on the Senate floor against the tidelands oil giveaway. The country needs more men of your courage and standing. Senator. It's men such as you that has made this country a better place to live in.

I pray God that you will continue your great work for many years to come. I am not much at writing letters, but I want to tell you in my humble way—thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY BAKER.

GLENCOE, ILL., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My congratulations to you upon your fight to conserve our natural resources, as dramatized in the tidelands oil fight. You are fighting the people's battle and we appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD A. KATZ.

HILLSIDE, N. J., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although I am not a resident of your State I want to thank you for the wonderful job you did in the Senate opposing the tidelands bill. We sorely need more men of your caliber in Washington. Here's to the defeat of the tidelands bill.

Most sincerely,

HENRIETTA FABRICANT.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My congratulations and commendation on your heroic work in speaking so long against the oil lands bill. You are on the right side and you have called attention to the matter in a dramatic and telling way.

I listened to your address over the radio this morning on Bill Leonard's This Is New York broadcast. It was superb, a classic, worthy of Burke and Gladstone, of Webster and Clay. It ought to be committed to memory by every schoolboy in the Nation. I hope you will put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would very much like to have a

copy of it, if it is in print, and if it is not too much trouble to send it to me. I shall appreciate it very much.

You are doing a great work. You stand out in lonely but glowing greatness in the midst of a somber background of conservatism, the apostle of liberalism, a man who, in the words of the great Markham, has the faith "to stand alone and vote with God."

Sincerely,

CHESTER A. SMITH.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are grateful to you for your stirring activities to preserve the country for its people.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ALEXANDER LLOYD.
Mr. and Mrs. L. WADDILL.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE:

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your fight to give the oil to the people of the United States. It is unfortunate that so little attention is being given to this important topic in the press and radio. I, therefore, feel that if your record-breaking speech accomplished anything at all it brought the news back home that an unfortunately small number of gallant Senators are trying to give the people what is rightfully theirs.

I would very much appreciate it if you could send me a copy of your speech on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which it appeared. I would be willing to pay any reasonable sum, if so necessary. Again congratulations, and more courage to you.

Sincerely,

JACK RENNERT.

BRONX, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some months it has been my intention to convey to you my deep admiration for the courageous positions you have taken in the exercise of your personal convictions in the Senate. Particularly after your recent dramatic show of opposition to the tidelands oil bill, I wish to add my few words of gratitude for your fine representation of the fairest thinking for the country at large.

I confess to a strengthened sense of faith and confidence in the pursuit of just government because of the caliber, all too rare, which characterizes your public life. It is my earnest wish that we can elect more representatives countrywide with the qualities you have come to typify—the personal integrity, the courage, the devotion to principle, and the refreshing intelligence.

Respectfully yours,

HERBERT L. FRIEDBERG.

STILLWATER, OKLA., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good going. Keep it up. You're doing a great job, and surely a grateful people will someday realize it.

Our only concern on hearing of your 22 hours' debate was for your health. Take care of yourself, because the country needs you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. J. S. VANDIVER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you for your fight on the tidelands oil issue. Many people of liberal spirit and independent mind are rooting for you.

With best wishes for your continued success,
I am

Yours very truly,
CHARLES A. TULLER.

PASSAIC, N. J., April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Even though I am not a citizen of your State and therefore deprived of the pleasure of voting for you as my representative, I would like you to know that I think you are without a doubt one of the finest legislators this country has and probably ever had. Your recent efforts to prevent the loss of the tideland oil to the people as a whole is in keeping with your extremely fine record. And I want you to know that you are not entirely unappreciated. My family also thinks you are pretty terrific.

Please keep it up. I wish there were many more like you in our Congress. The United States is better off because you entered politics.

I wish you much luck and hope that you are victorious in 1956. This country needs you.

Sincerely yours,
BERNICE ZACHARY.

SUMMIT, N. J., April 28, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a hasty word of thanks—though you deserve volumes—for the splendid manner in which you are expending your time and energies in behalf of all of us in the tidelands oil matter.

My family joins me in this expression of appreciation.

With very best wishes to you, I am
Sincerely yours,

HARRIET DE VOY.

MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING
AND TECHNOLOGY,

SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My hearty congratulations and thanks for your fine presentation of facts and great fight in behalf of our Nation's resources and the common man's vital interest in these resources.

It is my sincere hope that your efforts may be rewarded with success. There seems to be a growing, active interest on the part of the public, which was blind when voting last fall, but may awaken in time to assist in holding some gains of past 20 years. Again my sincere thanks.

Very truly yours,
MILTON E. SCHERER.

TROY, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my congratulations on your fine performance in delaying a miscarriage of justice by 22 hours and some minutes. I am not an admirer of the filibuster as a technique, but, of course, the course being pursued by you and Senator ANDERSON and others is not a filibuster, since it is designed not to kill the tidelands bill but to shed a little light on the umbrageous souls who are its proponents.

I have meant to write you praising your honest and courageous stand during the campaign and your genuinely heroic act in cutting yourself off from the victorious Republican Party. You have been badly maligned by such newspapers as the Troy Record and the Bangor Daily News, both "black" (as opposed to liberal) Republican papers.

The more they have hollered about you the more convinced I have become that you must be a pretty good guy.

More power to you, sir.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR LEE HOMAN.

CHADBOURN, N. C., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE:

Your great and history-making speech on the Senate floor opposing the tidelands oil bill I'm sure will be appreciated by many millions of people who comprehend the true value of fairness and justice. I have written both North Carolina Senators urging them to oppose this bill. I send my deep and heartfelt appreciation for the work you are doing in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
FULTON R. LUPO.

JAMAICA, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my admiration and wholehearted agreement for the fight you are engaged in against the tidelands bill. I am in favor of continuing the fight by a true filibuster to prevent a vote being reached.

Very truly yours,
IRVING BERLER.

CLIFTON, N. J., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a few lines to express my thanks for your strenuous efforts to preserve the so-called tidelands for the benefit of all of the people of the United States.

I do not know whether or not you will be successful but it is wonderful to know that we do have a few men in the Senate of your courage and integrity.

Very sincerely yours,
ARCHIE J. CADZOW.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We may be out in the hinterlands and not expected to know what is going on in the Capital but we surely have followed the fate of the tidelands bill and rejoiced at your fight for Federal ownership. This may sound strange coming from California but who else knows what we did not get while the State had the oil money.

Whatever else was expected in the way of benefits, the beaches were supposed to have wonderful care and be a credit to California. If anything is said now about neglect, it is laid to impounded money but don't let that fool you—for many years our beautiful beaches have had no improvements and scanty care. I have been a beach addict about 35 years and know what is missing—adequate cleaning, lifeguards, comfort stations, piped water, incinerators, or benches. No, no rows of small rooms for changing suits, no lockers, no umbrellas or playpens to be rented—sand, water, and sky as nature made them. Not much like the East.

When I reflect on the Federal parks and the many locations that would enjoy having one, I hope the Government will get control of the oil money for schools and more parks. So three cheers for your hours of effort, and I believe they have not been in vain.

Very truly yours,
ANNA D. CLARK.

WICHITA, KANS., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are putting up a great fight for the good of public interests. Keep up the good work.

CHARLES N. MITCHELL.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read in today's New York Times about your record-

breaking speech against the pending offshore-oil bill.

Congratulations for your good work in trying to prevent this unconscionable attack on the public resources from succeeding. I hope you are able to awaken the public to the legalized pilfering which this measure would entail.

Best wishes for success.
JUSTIN W. COLLAT.

PASADENA, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a long-time admirer, I want to thank you for your most recent valiant effort to save America for all the people. It gives us a sense of real security to have you in Washington and fighting for the tidelands for the schools and colleges. May you win in this fight and in those which follow.

Most sincerely yours,
PRISCILLA BEATTIE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA. April 20, 1953.

Congratulations on your record and on breaking the newspaper conspiracy of silence. Keep up the good work and don't let them bring tidelands oil to a vote.

PAULA MARKOWITZ.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your fervent battle against tidelands oil.

Yours truly,
LES LACHARLIE,
CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Congratulations on your great talk against the oil grab. Thank you for making the honest opposition dramatic and for effectively calling the attention of the American people to what is happening.

Sincerely,
LEON W. DESPRES.

APRIL 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I love you and am watching the tidelands oil fight with more than interest. Just to know we have men like you in the legislative body boosts my morale 100 percent. Wrote my Illinois Senators and have the answers; now I will work personally next election—a new experience. No thanks are sufficient for what you have done and are doing. Hurrah.

Mrs. H. BERTSON.

ALTOONA, PA., April 27, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I approve of your support in oil dispute in my behalf. Thanks.

PAUL H. BYRNE.

DEARBORN, MICH., April 26, 1953.

MY MOST RESPECTED SENATOR: May I offer my congratulations on your fight against the tidelands steal. Your courage will set many minds in a course of open criticism against such calculated greed.

Respectfully,
ERWIN F. UERAN.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Congratulations on your courage to stand and talk against the tidelands grab bill. Good job well done.

Mrs. L. BLAWIE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to congratulate you on your heroic 22-hour talk against the infamous tidelands bill which would turn over the Nation's resources into the hands of a few individuals.

Your speech gave us the needed time to write to our own Senators asking them to vote against this bill.

Respectfully yours,
A. SAIPER.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.
Fight for the rights of the American people.
The tidelands belong to all of the people.
Thank you for all you are doing.
FRANK P. KARANDYS.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., April 27, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I certainly appreciate your terrific efforts in my behalf and that of the people to save for them and me the resources that belong to all of us.
Teapot Dome sure would be just a teapot in comparison with this attempted grab.
Sincerely,
COURTNEY K. SHILL.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 26, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courageous effort to arouse the American people on the injustice of the State-owned offshore-oil bill.
Your continuous effort to fight for the rights of the common people and uphold democracy in America is rejoicing to all liberal-minded Americans. The people of Oregon should be rightly proud of you.
Respectfully yours,
CARL B. MILLER.

CHICAGO, ILL.
MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for Senators like you. Keep on fighting. It is an honor to call you Senator. Hope you keep on fighting for oil. Keep rats from selling the people out.
God bless you.
Sincerely,
ELIZABETH WEBER.

PASADENA, CALIF.
Three cheers for you. Stay with us, Wayne. There are plenty of Californians who are not fooled.
Pay no attention to huckster press.
And other States will say plenty in '54 on this sellout to monopoly.
D. O'BRIEN.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 27, 1953.
Thank you for your wonderful and courageous stand on the offshore oil issue. I only hope that we can have a few more outstanding and able men like you in the Senate so that we fellow citizens can be assured of a bright future, and look forward to better government. Thank you, again.
Mrs. H. T. MILGROM.

SEATTLE, WASH.
DEAR SIR: We wish to express admiration and thanks to you for your filibuster and other efforts to stop the passage of the tidelands bill.
EVA NYSTROM.
ESTHER BITZENHOFFER.

FORT SLOCUM, N. Y.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is actually the first communication I have ever written to anybody in Washington, yet, I feel it's my duty as a citizen, and a member of the Armed Forces to express my admiration for the gallant efforts on your part to defeat the offshore oil grab. Had we but more representatives of your caliber to act as the people's spokesmen, the processes of our democracy would not be so hampered.
Sincerely,
Pfc L. SARIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for fighting so hard for what you know is right and good for the people. We appreciate it.
What can I do to help you and your colleagues in this fight?
This can lead to an example of real democracy in action, where the will of the people is carried out by its representatives in spite

of a coalition in support of selfish interests.
Keep fighting.
Respectfully yours,
HARRY GROSSWEINER.

FLORAL PARK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
You deserve the heartfelt support of the citizens of the United States in your effort against the tidelands oil-grab bill. May you have good health to continue the fight.
Dr. GERALD RUBIN.

HYATTSVILLE, MD., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: We are greatly appreciative of your great efforts to save the tidelands oil for the people of the United States. Keep up the good work.
We've already written our Senators expressing our views.
Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. J. COOPERMAN.

ALTOONA, PA., April 28, 1953.
Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.
DEAR SIR: "The rose in his lapel had wilted, but the Senator looked fresh and fit at the end of his marathon." Such was the description I received of your speech the other day in regards to the tidelands grab.
Your effort in behalf of the people of our Nation, I assure you, is not going unnoticed.
Our founders, had a vigorous faith in God, depending upon His help to make the new Nation strong.

Such faith, therefore, made the powers of one's vote, for good or evil the most challenging thing in the American life. A vote on God's side gave strength and justice to the people, stimulating the Nation's strength. A vote otherwise, is of a godless nature, and brings strength to the corruption, and materialism that has seeped into our political life, and is greater to be feared than communism without for it tends to weaken from within.

To combat this evil, we must have spiritual strength in our leadership and morality in high places. We feel throughout America, that you can qualify as such a warrior, and our prayers are to that end.
For it is not enough to print "In God we trust" on our coins, we must write it across the very soul of America if we are to survive. Keep up the good fight.

J. L. MEGAHAN.
P. S.—The enclosures contain a special certificate we use for Mothers Day. It is blank. Why not you and your children sign it and present it to your wife on that day. Happy in the knowledge that the Nation requested it, and approve your great work.

ANGOLA, IND.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to sincerely thank you for your valiant fight against the tidelands bill. I hope you keep up the fight if it takes all year.
If the United States Congress wants to give up the oil to the several States in question, they might as well pass a law to donate the national parks, United States territories, grazing lands, and post offices to the States in which they lie.
Please convey my feelings to the Senators who are with you in this fight.
Respectfully,
Dr. M. J. BLOUGH.

ORLANDO, FLA., April 27, 1953.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your efforts to prevent the loss of the offshore-oil

resources of the United States. I hope you and your associates will continue this educational debate until the public are sufficiently aroused to defeat this bill.

The boundaries of the United States extend 3 miles to sea. The seaward boundaries of Florida, Texas, and all other coastal States extend to the seaward boundaries of the United States—3 miles, not 10½ miles.
Yours sincerely,
HARLAN ROBERTS,
Registered Florida Voter.

WILLOW RUN, MICH., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are thrilled by your sincere efforts to bring the real facts concerning the offshore-oil issue to the public. Our heartiest congratulations in forcing the opposition to realize the determination and sincerity of your debate. With you and the other fine group of honest men in the Senate, those of us who shudder at some of the irresponsible people in Washington can rest assured that they won't carry out their narrow and selfish plans unchallenged.

We offer our appreciation and encouragement in your continued successful service to the things that our Nation stands for here and abroad so that we can come closer in reality to the basic principles we proclaim.
Very sincerely,
HARRY and BETTY LEE HUTCHINSON.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF., April 27, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to express our appreciation for the wonderful fight you are making to prevent our rich tidelands, with their potential oil beds, from being given outright to a few border States that in turn would hand them over to private interests for their personal exploitation.

We believe the people as a whole, resent such biased liberality on the part of our representatives, but are too apathetic to do anything about it. We regret our own apathy, for this is the first time we have ever made an effort to express our thanks to a public official for his fight against the powers of greed. It is disturbing that we get so few liberal-minded men in our lawmaking bodies. Thanking you.

A copy of this is being mailed to Senators KEFAUVER and HUMPHREY.
Sincerely,
W. J. MORGAN,
STELLA M. MORGAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 27, 1953.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your brave stand and hard work in the interests of all the people on the so-called tidelands oil bill.

I think our country is in a most dangerous position now and our internal troubles seem to me more frightening than those that threaten us from outside. As long as we have a few people like you who will speak out in protest we still have some hope and it has been somewhat reassuring to me that this bill was not rushed through as the Republicans expected it to be.

I have just written to Mr. Eisenhower urging him to veto this bill and I told him I was thankful for Senators like you who were fighting for the national interests.

I don't know what more private citizens can do except protest but we can make our ideas known through men like you and Senator ANDERSON and the others who are on the side of the people.
Sincerely yours,
MARY B. SWABEY.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Allow me to congratulate you on your record-breaking Senate oratory.

The millions of us common people of these United States owe you a debt of gratitude. I hope that this is only one of a million humble but appreciative letters of thanks that you receive.

May God give you strength, perseverance, and sufficient support from your colleagues to preserve the tidelands oil for "We the people."

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. FLORY.

SOUTH SHAFTSBURY, VT., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your speech against the tidelands oil bill. I hope this bill will be defeated, so keep on fighting. I believe our Senator AIKEN will vote to back you up on this issue.

Yours truly,

VERDER ELWELL.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my thanks for your most magnificent efforts in the debate of offshore oil.

I sincerely hope your efforts will not be in vain.

Sincerely yours,

MARGUERITE S. DISPENZA.
Mrs. Anthony.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your great feat of stamina performed in the interest of good government and conservation of our greatest source of liquid fuel.

I was thrilled by your performance on the Senate floor for over 22 hours.

Keep up the good work. I am sorry I don't live in Oregon so that I could vote for you.

Now, we have a small group of Senators giving the hidebound reactionaries a dose of their own medicine—the filibuster.

Again, I say, keep up the good work, Senator.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. GREENE.

APRIL 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your valiant stand against the tidelands oil issue. You have many supporters among our friends in the teaching profession.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELIZABETH TUCKER.

NORTH VALLEY STREAM, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your valiant and courageous struggle against the powerful interests that wish to steal this country's resources from their rightful owners, the people.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL BARR.

LEVERETT, MASS.

Nice going, we're with you all the way.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT WETHERBEE.

WELLESLEY, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do not know what I think of filibusters in the abstract. As long as they are legal I cannot think of a better cause than in holding back the tidelands oil bill. Congratulations on your record, but most of all on your courage.

HUGH BARLSONE.

AMES, IOWA, April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hooray for you, Senator MORSE I and many others in this vicinity are with you 100 percent in defeating the bill establishing State ownership of the oil submerged coastal lands. Keep up the good work and encourage others to do the same. Others from Iowa State College also wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely,

STIG R. ERLANDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

I wish to extend my congratulations on your valiant fight against the oil steal of the vested interests, and for your efforts in behalf of the people generally.

Too bad the people do not elect more Senators like you.

Best wishes,

CHARLES B. ELLIS.

HANLONTOWN, IOWA, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on the splendid fight you are making in the interest of the people. I was a disciple of Old Fighting Bob La Follette and rejoice that there is still men in the United States Senate unafraid to stand up for the people.

In one campaign Senator La Follette went into the home State of reactionary Congressmen and read the roll call on their votes on popular issues and defeated 17 Congressmen in 1 campaign. You can do the same. Strength to your arm.

Very respectfully,

S. L. SANDERSON,
An Iowa Farmer.

HANFORD, CONN., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Please carry on the great fight against the big giveaway.

God bless you.

Very truly yours,

C. J. FREEDMAN.

DALLAS, TEX.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE:

I am aware that you are laboring so earnestly against the passage of the States rights of tidelands. I am in accord with you as I believe a thing is either right or it is wrong. When money is involved, a majority opinion regarding its ministry is always evil and accomplishes evil things. Thus, I am convinced that help from God must be had in this to defeat these forces at work.

Do you believe in prayer, and do you realize the dynamic force it has? I do. I pray to God for all things, and He will answer them if it is His will. Senator MORSE, I promise you surprisingly turn of events, if you will put this case before God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost. He hears all prayers and answers them all. I am praying earnestly against State ownership of tidelands, and for you to know what to say to see that the high principles of Christian virtues erect themselves in the minds of these money-mad men.

Ask several other of your Senator friends to pray with you. I will pray, too, and we shall all see these bad forces defeated.

I am a young girl of 24, who strives to know God's will and to see things right, as He would want them to be. This letter is in His will, for it is a message of truth and honesty.

I shall greatly appreciate it if your secretary, etc., would have you read this personally. Have even your secretary pray for it with you. May our Christian Government own these offshore lands.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HILL.

GALVESTON, TEX.

We are with you 100 percent-plus for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24 speech.

Respectfully,

L. W. FRASER.

MOKANE, MO., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My family and I wish to commend you on your most recent stand on the tidelands oil bill, now before the Congress. It was your rather lengthy speech that moved me from out of the inertia that I found myself in and caused me to write this letter to you, as well as to both of the Missouri Senators.

Again, the best of luck to you and the courageous stand that you have taken on many issues in the present (as well as past) congressional session. My feeling is that there are innumerable people who feel as I do, but never quite get around to putting it down on paper and sending it on to their Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY S. PEGLER.

BILLINGS, MONT., April 25, 1953.

Have just heard of your record-breaking Senate speech on tidelands oil. Thank you for your work in the interests of the people. We need champions of the people in Congress.

Sincerely,

LOUISE and WILLIAM PFISTER.

CORYDON, IOWA, April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our sincere congratulations for your work in the Senate.

Although Iowa citizens and members of the Democratic Party, we have watched your career ever since you became a Senator, and have always had great admiration for your principles and your willingness to battle for the right, as you so wonderfully demonstrated in your recent battle for the rights of all citizens of the United States against the infamous tidelands oil steal.

Mr. Ward's brother, Loren Ward, is editor of the Benton County Review at Philomath, Ore.

We watch national politics with much interest and lately with alarm, and are thankful for men like you in Government who place the good of the Nation above party politics. Long may you wave.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. A. WARD.

KEOKUK, IOWA, April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your splendid efforts. If we are sold out, we find consolation in the knowledge that there are a few of you who have guts enough to call them on their moves. Thanks again.

Respectfully,

JAMES DEITRICH.

SOUTH KENT SCHOOL,

South Kent, Conn., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I do not approve of the filibuster, I do believe strongly that your stand on the tidelands bill is the correct one. I have written my two Senators.

I also would like to state that I believe you are serving in a very useful role in the Senate.

Most sincerely,

CHARLES P. WHITTEMORE.

MAMARONECK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to offer you my congratulations on your heroic opposition to the pending tidelands oil bill. I stand unequivocally behind the Supreme Court decision establishing Federal ownership and control of tidelands oil, and it is my belief that a majority of the people in the country do too, Congress to the contrary notwithstanding.

I trust that you will not soon find the need of affirming your convictions so dramatically, but may you continue to enjoy the good health and strength you need to keep on battling. Would that the Senate had more like you!

May I say thank you for all you are trying to do to protect the interests of all the people.

Sincerely,

MARGARET B. REICH,
 Mrs. Alan I. Reich.

WYNKOTE, PA., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Once again we owe you thanks for your courage and fair-mindedness in opposing States rights to tidelands oil.

Please continue the fight and how about more publicity so the public knows what's going on. Thanks.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. A. GOTTESFELD.

HARRISBURG, PA., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts are not in vain—we are watching and appreciating every effort to keep this administration under control—if it is possible!

More power to you; and thanks.

Sincerely,

L. K. DICKINSON.

WICHITA, KANS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your performance as a great Senator and a fighter for the real American way.

We need more representatives like yourself, with ability, courage, and the energy to make their ideals shine.

Continue to dig out and tell the Senate and the American people the facts and your conclusions on the things we should know so that we can vote and act intelligently.

Respectively yours,

PAUL H. GEDING.

CLINTON, ILL., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write this to congratulate you on your efforts to stop this oil bill. Who could an independent private citizen like myself write to; that is, who holds the balance of power in voting on this bill? I understand there are some western Senators who are in between. I hope you and Senator DOUGLAS and the other Senators opposing this bill will receive some help. Why hasn't Eisenhower opposed this bill? Keep up the good work.

Regards,

GEORGE E. COOLEY.

MIDWEST CITY, OKLA., April 26, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can't help but admire your wisdom and courage you have shown in public life. Your picture appeared on the front page, and this is something, for, you see, we only have one paper in Oklahoma City. Sometimes he is a Republican and sometimes a Democrat, and between he is nothing, as, being the only one, a great many of us are forced to read it. Perhaps

this letter doesn't mean anything to you, but you see we all admire you. It's too bad we haven't more like you. May God bless you and your family. I just can't express myself—my admiration for you. Keep the good work up and some day you will bring the rest to their right minds. Again may God bless you.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

JOE DON.

STATE COLLEGE, PA., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of congratulations upon your recent lengthy speech—but even more important, your stand on the tidelands-oil issue.

I commend your stand in the Senate and am thankful we have a man of your caliber and wisdom to speak for us. Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

JANE R. JENKS.

MUSKEGON, MICH., April 27, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
 United States, Senate,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep appreciation to you for your courageous and exhausting effort in opposing the submerged lands bill. As citizens we should all be gravely concerned about the principles and very serious consequences involved, should these lands be turned over to the States. We must hope that your efforts may be effective in preventing such a giveaway of the Nation's valuable natural resources.

It is becoming clearly evident what the Republican administration's domestic program will mean to our country. We admire your courageous stand in putting the welfare of the Nation above party politics.

Sincerely yours,

MURIEL V. LEWIS.

GREENSBORO, N. C., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Even in a busy student's schedule, there is time to write and tell you that your courage in supporting Hill's proposal is appreciated. As a man in a peculiar position, you are indeed brave.

But now the proposals of Messrs. ANDERSON and HILL have been pigeonholed, starved to death, for the sake of political obligations. If a great wave of protest mail has influence of any sort—I intend to help swell it.

And therefore this letter is not of as great importance, except that within myself, I feel I must thank you for bringing this before the people, despite your knowledge of its being a losing battle.

Sincerely yours,

LOIS PETERS.

ELGIN, ILL., April 27, 1953.

HONORABLE SENATOR: You are carrying on a great tradition of educating before crucial legislation. Best wishes for retaining our national heritage.

W. HILL.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I applaud your stand on the offshore oil issue. We wish we were your constituents so that we could vote for you next time you stand for election.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES L. WOODRESS.

SOUTH BEND, IND., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I would like to congratulate you on your recent talk against the offshore oil grab. It's a pity and a shame what extremes a person has to go through in order to try to convince others to do what they believe

is right but haven't the intestinal fortitude to vote as their conscience dictates.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN GANG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.:

The Optometrists Guild would like to congratulate you on your fight against the tidelands oil grab. We hope your fight will come to a successful conclusion.

K. FIELD,

Secretary, Optometrists Guild, Local
 51, UOIWA-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.:

The executive board of local 1s, United Department Store Workers of America, CIO, representing 8,000 Macy workers congratulates you for the principled position and courageous fight to save tideland oil for the people of the United States. We urge you to continue to use all your strength toward this worthy end.

PHILIP HOFFSTEIN,

Vice President and Executive Board
 Chairman.

KORD MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,

New York, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your work in opposing the tidelands oil grab.

I do not see why our Senate and Congress should make a present of this great oil reserve to a few States. Our country's natural resources belong to all the States and to the country as a whole. I cannot understand how the legislative body should have the desire or the authority to give it away and I strongly urge that you do everything in your power to prevent this.

Very truly yours,

KORD MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
 SIDNEY UNGER, President.

BEREA, KY., April 27, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
 United States Senator,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: More power to you. Doubt if there's much chance of stopping the "big steal," but the valiant effort to prevent the selfish skulduggery gets my approbation.

Yours faithfully,

J. L. BOWLER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to commend you for your efforts in delaying action on the tidelands oil vote. Your "talkathon" was certainly in the best interests of all of the people. Thank you for keeping faith with the American people, regardless of political and sectional pressures. We think you are doing a wonderful job.

Very truly yours,

Dr. and Mrs. M. LOVENSTEIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this to commend you on your terrific fight to bring the issue involving the tidelands to the attention of the American people. You and the courageous Senators who are fighting

this giveaway have inspired every fair-minded citizen I know. I wrote the two Senators from California and also President Eisenhower. I only wish that I had the privilege of being one of your constituents.

Very sincerely,

K. G. FLYNN

Mrs. Thomas J. Flynn.

MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been hearing over the radio much about your lengthy speech against the Government giving away free oil rights along the coast of three States. You have my praise. If you have copies of it for distribution may I have one? or if not, and it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, please advise which page it begins on.

Very respectfully,

G. E. BOYD.

MENCHEY MUSIC SERVICE,

Hanover, Pa., April 28, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. MENCHEY.

MONTE MADE PRODUCTS,

El Monte, Calif., April 27, 1953.

The Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to send you my appreciation for your stand in the tidelands issue. You are doing a great service for all the people in this country in speaking out against the tidelands steal.

Although the newspapers of this State are overwhelmingly for giving the tidelands back to the States involved, still they do not reflect a unanimous feeling on the part of the individual citizen.

A great many people here in Southern California are heartened by your action, and urge you to keep up the fight against the tidelands being returned to the States.

Congratulations on your courageous 22-hour speech to awaken the people of America.

Sincerely,

D. F. BRAY.

EMORY UNIVERSITY,

Emory University, Ga., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to congratulate you upon your stand in the fight over the tidelands oil bill. I am sure that the Americans deeply appreciate what you have done and are trying to do.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

LYNWOOD M. HOLLAND.

FARMERSVILLE, OHIO, April 28, 1953.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to commend your courage in opposing the tidelands oil giveaway.

We should have more statesmen like you, and less political hacks like those favoring the giveaway.

ROY BICKEL.

ROSUNDALE, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel that your dramatic underdog stand on the tidelands issue has served to swing public opinion which I feel is now beginning to mount.

Keep up the good work.

I only hope that I'm back in Oregon in 1956 to offer you my active support.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. SAVAGE, Jr.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations on your magnificent 22½-hour speech in the tidelands oil case.

Your unselfish viewpoint for the good of the entire country is highly commendable. Keep up the fight.

Mrs. ALICE FERNANDEZ.

St. PETER, MINN., April 27, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your speech. History will prove that you and your friends were right in protecting the interest of all the people.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. FORELL.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations on your unselfish, nonpartisan fight against the tidelands oils case and other pet projects of the sharp operators. I certainly wish that you represented Michigan, as I feel you are representing all the people.

J. M. FERNANDEZ.

BEVERLY, N. J., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on your wonderful speech. I hope you can keep up the opposition to this offshore oil bill. We think Senator HILL's bill is the best one and maybe would help reduce some of our school expenses, which are getting higher every year. Wishing you success.

ROSE PEARCE.

KANSAS CITY, MO., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your stand regarding tidelands oils.

J. R. HODGES.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In behalf of three sons and myself, I desire to extend to you and other United States Senators congratulations and best wishes in your efforts to prevent special-interests groups from taking over this Nation's natural resources.

Seems their efforts are not too well publicized. I am sure when well understood by average citizens your efforts will be fully supported.

Sincerely,

CHAS. E. SANDERS.

ELGIN, ILL., April 28, 1953.

SENATOR: Congratulations on your fight on behalf of all us Americans.

M. SWILANDE.

DEXTER, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I do not uphold filibustering, this is one time it is being used for a good cause. So keep up with the good work. I still intend to do my best for you in 1956.

Respectfully yours,

FRED J. HAYES.

OBERLIN, OHIO, April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to express vigorous approval of and appreciation for your courageous stand on the tidelands question.

We admire you for your fortitude as well as for your idealism.

Sincerely,

JUDY MOLLIN.

BARBARA ROSENER.

FELICE SHOEMAKER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 28, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon, United States
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write this letter as a note of encouragement and appreciation for your efforts to stop the giveaway of rights which belong to the people of the United States and not to California, Texas, and Louisiana. I feel that public opinion is gradually gaining momentum against the giveaway, and if others like you, and you, can hold out long enough, the measure as suggested by the Republicans will not pass. Such gestures as your long speech in the Senate help to call public attention to this vital issue.

Respectfully,

Mrs. C. I. COCHRAN.

PRINCETON, N. J., April 28, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your valiant fight against the pending offshore oil bill, and I hope it meets with success.

I enclose a copy of a letter I am sending to one of the Senators from New Jersey. A letter in similar vein is also being sent to the other Senator from this State.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD W. HEROLD.

MUSKEGON, MICH., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your valiant effort to prevent voting on the tidelands oil bill. I sincerely hope that in the national self-interest of the country the revenues from tidelands oil be safeguarded by the Federal Government for the benefit of American schools, colleges, and universities.

Let me say again how much I appreciate your effort, which I hope will be the means of defeating the bill.

Yours very sincerely,

ANNA VAN BUSKIRK,
Retired teacher.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Your speech against the oil grab gave us a tremendous lift. It showed that we still have some legislators who think in terms of the public and national welfare.

These are the things we will remember when we vote in November.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. I. RIVKIN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator MORSE:

Congratulations on your splendid effort for Federal control of the tidelands. Though the issue seems doomed for State ownership, the valiant effort, on your part and your colleagues, will not have been in vain. With this prolonged debate, you have given the American people, time to think of the issue and circumstances surrounding it. A country as big and powerful as we, need some reserves to fall back on. State ownership of the tidelands does not insure all Americans of a great oil reserve. I also think the tidelands issue should give to the American people an idea, what would happen, if all Federal reserves, such as national parks, forests, power projects and etc. were turned over to individual States. Congratulations again, Senator, on your wonderful work and don't falter for a moment. We need your type of thinker and doer, in our Government. You have proven the great American heritage, that we, as free men, can still think for ourselves and the good of all mankind.

Yours truly,

MORGAN D. LEADLEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your herculean effort to stem the vote on the tidelands bill.

People who believe that the Federal Government is going to be robbed by this bill, as I do, wish there were more Senators acting like you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDITH PORTER.

DOYLESTOWN, PA., April 29, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity to commend you for the outstanding work you have been doing to defeat the tidelands oil bill.

While it seems as though the bill will be passed, I sincerely hope you and your colleagues do not feel you have been fighting in vain.

You have done a magnificent job of bringing to the people what is going on.

Sincerely yours,

ELSA L. SACCO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR SIR: Allow me to congratulate you for your 22-hour-long speech, fired with conviction and sincerity, to protect the property of all the people from the greedy and selfish interests of the few.

With my best wishes for your good health, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

MISS LIDDY ROSAK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Our thanks are extended to you for your amazing display of courage and stamina. Keep up the good work.

NETTIE BILLY,

President, Local 548, Laundry
Workers Joint Board of Greater
New York, ACWA.

ALLABEN, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your speech against the tidelands oil bill.

The eyes of the common man all over the country are upon you because once in a blue moon a man comes along who has a mind of his own and who also has the courage to stand up against the crowd and fight for what he thinks is right. There should be more men like you in Congress. There are too many Yes men representing the people in Washington. Congratulations.

Yours truly,

EDW. J. OCKER, JR.

NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for enduring a 22-hour speech in an effort to block the oil grab. Quixotic as it is, I admire your courage and principles.

I have been able to read your comments to the press (even though they usually are in back of the paper) and have heartily approved of your efforts and speeches.

I only wish I could help democracy's cause here in our country, as you are doing in the Senate.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THAIS LATHAM.

NEW YORK CITY, April 29, 1953.

DEAR SIR: You were magnificent. I know that all of the people owe you perpetual thanks for your battle against the legal

leger-de-main of the know-nothings. Thank you very much.

BEN FOLLMAN.

LOUISVILLE, KY., April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you on your fine speech opposing the tidelands oil bill. I'm bitterly opposed to this bill, too. It is regrettable that we don't have more Senators like you in the Senate. I hope that our two Senators from Kentucky vote against this bill on May 5. I have asked them to do so. You can bet your life I'll be watching the vote list. More power to you.

Yours truly,

W. KESSINGER.

FAIRLAWN, N. J., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to thank you for your untiring efforts on behalf of the Nation, as a whole, regarding the tidelands oil bill. Even if such unfortunate type of legislation is passed, your courageous and ethical stand will not be forgotten.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. B. TRIFFLEMAN.

MADISON, WIS., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation of your very great effort to slow up the vote on the tidelands oil bill, and to help make more people conscious of the danger to their long-range welfare involved in that bill.

I have just finished reading Bernard de Voto's Easy Chair, in Harper's magazine for May 1953. He is convinced that Congress will not allow such a tremendous and irrevocable steal to be perpetrated on we people of the United States. I hope he is right. I am not so optimistic myself, and I have had many fears about how the interests of we common people would be protected with a power-hungry Republican Party in the saddle.

I am an independent voter, as was my father before me. I admired your courage also in becoming an independent—in being true to your principles grounded in high moral values. Thank you for so well representing the real public interests in our country.

Long may you be in the Senate—unless you can run for an even higher office some day.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGARET S. BERGSENG.

NEW YORK CITY, April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As you can see by this writing paper, I'm not one to write letters. Just quick notes.

I am one of the myriad Americans who mean to do but never do anything but talk about what should be done.

Admiration and humored respect for you has been in my mind since August 1952. And your speech on tidelands oil has prompted me to tell you of my high esteem for you. (Esteem is more than regard, hm?)

If there is any way I can help, please put me on your list.

Sincerely yours,

DORIS FELTSOTT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on that stirring speech. You have our support, Senator.

KENNETH BOLT,

President, Local 332, Laundry
Workers Joint Board of Great-
er New York, ACWA.

NEW YORK CITY, April 29, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE:

I want to thank you for the wonderful job you are doing in regard to this oil grab. I want to congratulate you on behalf of thousands of our members in our union which I am on local board of same, the Transport Workers Union of America. Thanking you again,

Yours truly,

JOSEPH P. CARROLL.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH., April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We in the United States are indebted to you for your fight against the tidelands oil bill.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CAROLINE L. BURLINGAME.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Congratulations on your tidelands oil speech. I know you are fighting for the benefit of all of us in this country. Thank you very much.

RICHARD B. WEISS.

SILVER STAR, MONT., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm sending you congratulations on your marvelous battle. All my enthusiasm, an accolade for your knight-hood. That's the spirit for our leaders as we struggle through these dark days. Men like you give us faith and hope and strength to go ahead.

May the Father of us all give us his priceless gifts and back us as we struggle for the right.

Your friend,

FLORA E. WRIGHT.

MANCHESTER, CONN., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to thank you very sincerely for your part in the defense of our country's natural resources in the present tidelands oil issue. If you are an example of a political independent then the country could do with a few more.

We have just written to our own "Representatives" PURTELL and BUSH urging them not to give away Connecticut's share of offshore oil.

Best of luck and keep up the good work.

PETER HARRIS,

(Mrs.) LOIS HARRIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to commend you for your success in focusing the attention of the public on the issues of the tidelands giveaway.

Your record-breaking 22-hour speech has disturbed the apathy of the public on this important legislative bill.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL-PANDELL STUDIOS,
GEORGE A. RUSSELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations, Senator, on your great speech. We are all against giving our country's heritage away.

ROGER D. DOUGLAS,

President, Local 446, Laundry Work-
ers Joint Board of Greater New
York, ACWA.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

Keep up your masterful work on the tidelands oil bill.
Best of luck.

JACK ARBIT.

LITTLE NECK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We sincerely thank you for your magnificent defense of the natural resources of this country. We support the stand you have taken on all recent issues.

Gratefully yours,
ABELL STURGIS, WIFE, and SON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As one of the American people for whom you spoke last week so arduously, I thank you and may God bless your efforts in our behalf.

Continue your fight to protect our Nation's natural resources and you will be long remembered.

Well done.

HUGH L. OWENS.

WELLESLEY, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the great fight versus those who would rob the Nation of its natural resources. History will vindicate you.

Sincerely,

RONALD B. EDGERTON.

SCHOOL OF LAW, YALE UNIVERSITY,
April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with a feeling of deep gratitude that I write you at this time to thank you for your courageous stand on the issue of offshore oil. Whether the pending legislation passes or not, you have striven to represent the people, and to educate the people. You are succeeding on both counts.

I thank you again for myself and many others here.

Sincerely,

MONTE LAZARUS.

HAMDEN, CONN., April 28, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for being the kind of Senator we can be proud of always, and thank you particularly for your work against the tidelands oil bill.

Yes, we've written our own Senators urging them to vote against the bill and have jogged our friends' pens, too. Wish we could do more.

Sincerely,

ELOISE and CLAUDE WELCH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please permit me to record this short word of hearty admiration for your many public spirited services and more particularly at this time for your valiant efforts to avert the scandalous steal embodied in the Holland bill on the tidelands.

The buccaneers are indeed riding high; it is well that you and those associated with you are making the going a little rough. Perhaps, only perhaps, the Supreme Court will yet prevent this shameful business.

Sincerely yours,

BENJ. JANER.

HOTEL WARWICK,
St. Louis, April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my sincere thanks for your splendid fight against the tidelands oil bill.

I have written my own two Senators (HENNING and SYMINGTON), who, as you know, are on your side. I wish I could do more to help.

Again thanking you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EARL E. LYON.

BRONX, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express my high appreciation of all your wonderful efforts on behalf of the future of our children so that the proceeds of the tidelands oil may benefit them in the years to come.

Wishing you all the success, I am,

Yours truly,

O. TIERNEY.

FOREST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Lyons Falls, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks very much for your gallant struggle to keep our Government from giving away its offshore oil. This means a great deal to me. I wish, of course, that the Senate did not have the privilege of unlimited debate; but if the southern reactionaries can use this to prevent the passage of civil-rights legislation, the liberals certainly have the right to use debate to prevent the giving away of our national resources. Perhaps this will teach our country that we ought to do something to make cloture a real possibility.

Gratefully yours,

JOHN H. HATT.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We admire and applaud your stand on the tidelands oil issue and other public questions. Keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. G. H. BRANDE.

OSWEGO, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your extraordinary 22-hour speech in the Senate last week. I sincerely hope that your talk, and others, will delay the vote on the tidelands giveaway until the facts of this fantastic sellout of the people's billions reach and arouse the Nation.

Have you read yet the article in this month's Harper's by Bernard DeVoto in which he compares land frauds of the past with this present-day giveaway? As there is so very little mention in the majority of newspapers about this issue, would it be possible to have De Voto's article read in the Senate and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. IELFIELD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to express our high appreciation of all your wonderful efforts in seeing that the proceeds of the tidelands oils will benefit our children in the years to come.

Wishing you all success, we are,

Cordially yours,

J. E. KRAMM.

MADISON, WIS., April 27, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to extend my personal thanks for your mighty efforts in preventing passage of the off-shore oil legislation. The physical sacrifice by you and the other Senators fighting this giveaway legislation is not unappreciated. I hope the good Lord will give you strength to continue your work. I am sure that if it is possible

to hold off a vote on the bill a couple weeks more, public interest and knowledge in the true nature of the legislation will force the side pressing its passage to capitulate. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

BERTON D. SHERMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Congratulations for your courageous stand in the oil grab bill. History will remember you as the Senator who put country before selfish party interest. Keep it on, and I am sure millions of our fellow citizens will remember who fought for the welfare of all.

Sincerely yours,

D. IGLESIAS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your ability, stamina, character, and all the other fine attributes of a great man.

Sincerely,

VIC MILLER.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to myself.

Before I begin a direct discussion of the amendment, I think a short reply to the most recent remarks of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, might be appropriate.

I wish to remind the Senator that while the Supreme Court has jurisdiction, authority, and heavy responsibility, never in the history of this Nation have we yet reached that abject state where the legislative branch is willing to underwrite every kind of interpretation by the Supreme Court of laws that happen to be on the books, when Congress feels that such interpretation would be such as to depart very greatly from what was intended when the laws being passed upon were enacted by Congress.

To the contrary, in the few years since I began my service in the Senate, I have noted five different matters, and perhaps there have been a great many more, in which, when the Supreme Court acted in such a way as to depart from the purpose of Congress in passing legislation, the court later found itself reversed to this extent only: That Congress passed additional legislation to express more clearly its purpose and intention, to express more clearly the law in a situation or to bring about a legal condition which Congress felt would better serve the general public. When those matters went back to the Supreme Court, after the passage of such legislation, not only has the Supreme Court frequently acquiesced and approved but there has never been any disposition on the part of the public, the Supreme Court, or anyone else, to contend for one moment that the respon-

sibility resting upon Congress, acting within its power so to adjust legislation as best to serve the people of this Nation, is not a recognized and unassailed responsibility.

If ever we were to ignore this fact, we would, in my opinion, be abdicating abjectly responsibilities which have been placed upon this great arm of government, the legislative arm, by the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment, after I have completed this point.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Oregon that he made somewhat the same argument when we were passing upon the portal-to-portal bill. As I recall the Senator then felt that the Congress, by passing legislation which corrected legislation then on the books, so that it would more nearly express the opinion, intention, and motive of Congress in passing the original legislation, would be overriding the Supreme Court, and he felt that we should not do so.

I ask the distinguished Senator if he recalls that when in the conscience of this country it became necessary to act and to rewrite a law, so as not to permit a false interpretation of what, at least, had been intended by Congress, Congress had the support of a tremendous majority of the people in passing the portal-to-portal law. That law, as I recall, was upheld when it reached the Supreme Court.

Likewise, I remind the Senator from Oregon of at least four other instances, which I mentioned the other day. There was the Wyoming oil case, in which Congress acted to convey to the State of Wyoming oil lands in the face of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court to the contrary, lands which Congress felt, in equity, justice, and sound dealing, should be regarded as lands of the State of Wyoming. I do not recall what was the position of the distinguished Senator from Oregon on that particular matter, but I believe the RECORD shows that both Houses of Congress passed that legislation by unanimous vote—because Congress determined that the real equities of the situation, ignoring the technical legal background against which the unanimous membership of the Supreme Court felt they must give their decision hostile to the claims of the State of Wyoming—by unanimous vote both Houses of Congress overrode that decision, in the sense that Congress rewrote the law, so as to accomplish what Congress regarded as equity.

I remember that in the case of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, Congress passed legislation which it felt was necessary to allow a practical handling of the problems of rate fixing for railroads. I remember hearing Senators on the floor cry to high heaven that we were denying the validity of the earlier decision of the United States Supreme Court in that case.

I recall that only last year, in the passage of the amendment or changes of the so-called Tydings Fair Trade Act, somewhat the same course was followed. I remember that the arguments of the

distinguished Senators who opposed the bill of last year were, in general, to the effect that Congress was assuming to rewrite a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Has the distinguished Senator from Oregon, or has anybody else, heard any complaint as to the right of Congress to exercise its responsibility, within its jurisdiction, in such a measure, in passing that bill only last year?

The fifth case that I remember is the Southeastern Underwriters case, where, in the face of an unfavorable decision of the United States Supreme Court, Congress took action, not once, but my recollection is, two or three times, first, temporarily, and then permanently, as I recall, to rewrite the law so as in effect to override an unfavorable decision of the Supreme Court.

So, in closing that point and before yielding to the Senator from Oregon for questioning, I merely wish to state again that Congress would adopt a submissive, abject attitude not at all justified by actions of Congress throughout all the years if it were to take the weak position that we have no duty and responsibility, such as we have frequently exercised with the approval of the country, and later with the approval of the Supreme Court, to rewrite legislation which has been turned down by the Supreme Court, or which has been misinterpreted by the Supreme Court, in order to accomplish the true intention of Congress in the passage of that legislation. We should rewrite it in such a case so as more effectively to express the original intention of Congress and so as to better serve the interests of the people as a whole.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. For my information, can the Senator from Florida tell me precisely how many cases rested upon the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not gone into the matter from that standpoint. Insofar as this pending matter is concerned, it had to be under the original jurisdiction of the court, because the Constitution does not allow a State to sue or be sued in any other form. But original jurisdiction or appellate jurisdiction is exactly the same in this respect, that any Supreme Court decision represents the judgment of the Supreme Court in a field given only to it, and I am the first to recognize the validity of the decision of the Supreme Court. But I am also among those who claim that if that decision be not in accord with the best interests of the Nation, if it departs from the intention of Congress, departs in this instance from the understanding which had prevailed and had been accepted by the Federal Government itself for 150 years, now to be followed by a decision with a majority of 4 to 3, in the Supreme Court which, in the opinion of the great majority of the Members of Congress is a decision revolutionary in effect, prejudicial to sound government, prejudicial to the protection of legal and democratic government, and prejudicial to the Nation as a whole, in that it would aggrandize to even more swollen proportions a Federal Government which is al-

ready too great and too far from the people, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not speak out frankly and pass additional legislation which would reshape the present law so as more clearly and better to serve the people as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me for not more than 1 minute to make a statement as to what I think my rebuttal of the Senator's statement is?

Mr. HOLLAND. I remind the distinguished Senator that he has already spoken twice on this amendment. So far as I am concerned I shall be very glad to yield, notwithstanding that fact. I believe this will be the second or third time during the debate that the Senator from Oregon has claimed the right to speak more times than the rules of the Senate permit. However, I think that course should continue, and the Senator from Florida is willing to accede to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Is the Senator from Florida asking unanimous consent to yield for the purpose of a statement, without yielding the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I will say to the distinguished Presiding Officer that I did not mean that I would yield at this stage, but that I would yield later out of my own time, if there is not sufficient time left at the disposal of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If the time is yielded by the distinguished Senator from Montana I will not raise the point of order. That is what I was trying to say.

Let us come for a moment to the debate on this particular amendment. I shall debate it under two aspects: First, with reference to its general place in this picture. I do not want any Member of the Senate or any citizen of the United States to think that this amendment is simply addressed to the question of water power and to the preservation of the rights of the Federal Government to develop water power, notwithstanding some threatening approach to that question which Senators think they can detect in this measure.

The real general purpose of this amendment is to refuse to attempt in any way to limit the new doctrine of paramount right and to refuse in any way to recite the conviction of the Congress that there are proprietary rights which can be exercised in the submerged offshore lands without in any respect endangering the paramount right of the Federal Government.

Senators will note that the words proposed to be stricken are the words "but shall not be deemed to include," so that this particular subsection would read as follows:

Sec. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to proprietary

rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

The original wording includes the words that the constitutional paramount right of the Federal Government in the named fields "shall not be deemed to include" certain proprietary rights of ownership, those being the ones granted by section 3, an earlier section of the joint resolution.

In other words, the purpose and effect of this amendment would be to fail to express one of the more important features contained in the joint resolution as the expression of Congress, namely, that the paramount rights based on national sovereignty which the Federal Government has, which it must continue to have, and which it must continue to exercise under the Constitution—rights in the fields of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs—do not, in the opinion of the Congress, in the event the joint resolution is passed require the Nation to extinguish or eliminate necessary or valuable proprietary rights of ownership such as those that are granted to the States and their grantees under section 3 of the joint resolution.

In other words, the purpose and effect of the passage of this amendment would be to bring about an affirmative expression of the Congress to the effect that there is no way whatsoever in which these paramount national rights may be in any way subverted and safeguarded except by the complete confiscation of every proprietary right in the submerged belt from the low-water mark out to the State line.

The Senator from Florida is not prepared to admit that conclusion. To the contrary, he thinks that there are many proprietary rights which are worth a great deal to the coastal cities, the coastal States, and the general public—rights which require development and use and which have been used for 150 years.

It is the view of the Senator from Florida that such proprietary rights can be properly recognized and used without in any way adversely affecting the constitutional national functions of controlling commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, and without impairing the carrying out of those purposes by the Federal Government. The Senator from Florida believes that the whole purpose of the joint resolution is to state that those proprietary rights and interests, so far as this field is concerned, which do not interfere with the exercise by the United States of its constitutional duties and responsibilities, can be subject to development and use in our traditional American way, and need not be subjected to nationalization or federalization, which purpose, after all, is the dominant theme of those who do not want to see any departure whatever from the provisions of the three decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, under which paramount right to all assets within that narrow coastal band from the mean low-water line out to the

State line is sought to be held solely for Federal use.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire how the Federal Government is going to carry out its programs on the navigable rivers of the country, where it is proposed to build multipurpose dams, unless it can enter upon the rivers for the purpose of constructing the works. It seems to me that the language in section 6 (a) takes away from the Federal Government the right to enter upon and use the beds of streams for the purpose of carrying on such construction work. I cannot understand why that is not clear to everyone who reads the language of the section.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator, in the first place, that while those submerged lands within State boundaries belong to the States, for many years they have been held, under the commerce clause, to be subject to the right of Congress, the right of the Nation, in connection with the building of dams, the development of water-power, and the use of those structures for other purposes, such as flood control, navigation, and reclamation. If the Senator will be patient with the Senator from Florida, he would prefer to give the answer to this particular question as he discusses subsection (d) of section 3, which he proposes to do.

Mr. President, in concluding my discussion of subsection 6 (a), I wish to call particular attention to the fact that every time the opponents of the joint resolution have approached this subject they have stopped with the word "resources" in line 3 on page 19. They always like to refrain from reading the qualifying words which come after the word "resources."

Let us go back and read a portion of the section.

After stating the retention and preservation by the United States of its constitutional powers—which it could not give up even if it wanted to do so, and which are powers in the field of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs—these words follow: "all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources"—and now I call particular attention to the following language—"which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

In other words, I would call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Montana and all other Senators who are interested in this point, the fact that the omission from the field of coverage of paramount national rights, which have first been stated in this section, does not extend so broadly as to omit all the proprietary rights of ownership, or all the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and their natural resources, but only those proprietary rights and those rights of management, adminis-

tration, leasing, use, and development "which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

I believe all those who have had fears about this section have had their fears because they failed to read the words "which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Florida that his 20 minutes have expired and that he has 86 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Having made that point clear, I think it is necessary now to return to section 3, because it is only against the complete recital of the provisions of section 3 that this field of property rights and values, which shall not be deemed to be included in the field of paramount rights affecting commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, can be measured.

It will not be the intention of the Senator from Florida to read entirely section 3 of the joint resolution, because he does not think it is necessary to do so. But he does want to call to the attention of his distinguished friend the Senator from Montana subsection (d) of section 3, which reads:

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

Mr. President, the intention of that provision, and we think the completely effective operation of that provision, in the granting or confirming section of the joint resolution, which is section 3, is to make it crystal clear that the joint resolution shall not in any way whatever affect the use, development, improvement, or control by the United States of lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, notwithstanding the fact that otherwise a grant or release of such lands and waters is given to the States.

We think that subsection does effectively retain and reserve to the United States and does effectively show such retention and reservation by the United States of all of its powers of regulation or improvement of navigation or powers to provide for flood control or production of power.

Mr. President, not only was the committee of that opinion, but I am pleased to say to the distinguished Senator from Montana and to his associates that these are words which were originally suggested by the Federal Power Commission itself as words sufficient in their opinion to completely safeguard the responsibility and jurisdiction which they hold for the United States Government

in an important field in which they represent the public, namely, the production of waterpower.

I may say, if Senators wish to pursue the matter back into the earlier hearings, they will find in the record of the hearings in the Senate on Senate bill 1988, in 1948, at page 852, a complete discussion of this subject, beginning there and extending into later pages of that document. They will find, for example, beginning with the report of the Federal Power Commission on S. 1988, which was then pending, the report being signed by the Honorable Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, it was pointed out that in the opinion of the Federal Power Commission there were some words of amendment which were needed in the bill as it had been proposed at that time, I believe in the 80th Congress. The point is made clear that the suggested amendment was in exactly this field to which the Senator from Montana has addressed himself, namely, the field of production of power by the building of dams on the streams and rivers of our Nation.

There is a scholarly discussion of the subject in that report, and Senators will find, as we move to later stages of the report, there are set forth additional instances in which Mr. Gatchell, who was then the Solicitor representing the Hydroelectric Power Division of the Federal Power Commission, appeared before the committee, and appeared after joint effort, incidentally, with Mr. Walter Johnson, former attorney general of the State of Nebraska, who was then representing and still represents the State attorneys general and the States in advocating this legislation.

Senators will find that in these later pages of the report it is made specifically clear—and I refer Senators now to page 1421, if they have the hearings before them—that the agreement which had been reached by Mr. Gatchell, acting for the Federal Power Commission—and incidentally, Mr. Leland Olds had appeared with Mr. Gatchell on his first appearance—that agreement being for the insertion of the words which would take care of the point they had made, was almost exactly in the same words as those which are still contained in the joint resolution in subsection (d) of section 3.

For instance, if Senators will read subsection (d) in the proposed joint resolution, and compare the language with the formula stated at the bottom of page 1421 and at the top of page 1422 of said hearings—agreed to in those hearings by Mr. Gatchell as representing the joint work of himself and Mr. Walter Johnson—they will find that the only difference between the present provision and that provision, of any substance at all—other differences being simply a word here and there—is that the agreement made at that time, included also the distribution of power, in addition to the production of power.

The committee later determined—and all presently interested in this matter, I assume, have determined conclusively, because it is a fact—that the distribution of power, which takes place, of course, on the land, and has nothing at

all to do with the actual building of the dams and the installation of the power machinery, had no proper relation to this joint resolution. The only thing which is omitted from the wording agreed to at that time is the reference in the original draft of the amendment which brought into the amendment the distribution of power, in addition to the production of power.

So Senators will see that beginning in 1948, and now coming forward to this good day, the Federal Power Commission has been saying to the Senate and its committee and to Congress and the public that the formula as expressed in the joint resolution now before the Senate does adequately protect the Federal Power Commission and the whole field of its jurisdiction over the development of hydroelectric public power, in which it represents the Federal Government.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate the argument which the Senator from Florida is making. As he points out, the joint resolution provides, in section 3, for the ownership of the lands beneath the navigable waters in the States.

Then on page 16, under subsection (d), authority is provided for the Federal Government to enter upon the lands and waters "for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power," and so forth.

Then the joint resolution continues; and on page 18—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes available to the Senator from Florida have expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to myself an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MURRAY. And then on page 18 we find the provisions of section 6, which deprive the Federal Government of these rights. That being a subsequent section of the joint resolution, it seems to me it would be controlling over the preceding provisions. Under section 6 we find language—which by our amendment we are seeking to remove—to the effect that the Federal Government would not have any right to enter upon and use the beds of the streams for the purpose of carrying on this construction work.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Montana, but I believe he is 100 percent wrong in the conclusion he reaches, because it is so very clear that section 6 preserves and protects this particularly important provision of section 3, and that all proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources, which are held not to be included within the paramount power of the United States to control commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, must be measured against and must be construed against all the provisions of section 3 of the joint resolution. I do not believe anything other than a careful reading of this section is required, in order for one to reach

that conclusion, as a matter of necessity, because the words which are to be found there are as follows: "all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

In other words, Mr. President, it is just as clear as it could possibly be made that it is not all proprietary rights of ownership or all rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are deemed not to be included in the paramount power of the United States over commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, but it is only—it is only, I repeat—those proprietary rights or other rights—and I quote again: "which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

Again returning to section 3, it appears conclusively that subsection (d) of section 3 does specifically provide that—

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

Mr. President, to bring the matter up to date, let me say that all Senators have on their desks the printed hearings of the executive sessions of our own committee at this particular session of Congress. If Senators will turn to page 1367 of the minutes of the executive sessions, they will find that Mr. Gatchell, the attorney for the Federal Power Commission, sat in with our able committee as it was finally writing the finishing touches on this measure, and just prior to the time when the committee reported the joint resolution to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. Gatchell there was questioned about the wording. Senators will find that, as shown at the bottom of page 1367 of part II of the hearings, Mr. Gatchell was questioned particularly with reference to this very subsection (d), which was a subsection in which he found new words, words which he had not put there on earlier occasions, and words to which he objected, and which were eliminated by the committee, so as to leave this particular reservation of power to the United States complete and, with the single exception that it does not cover distribution of power, in the precise form in which it was when it was placed in earlier bills, and in which it has been carried forward up to this time, so that it now appears in the pending joint resolution.

So, Mr. President, it would appear conclusively that our committee has not only followed this point carefully, but it

has not been satisfied with expressing its own judgment, and that it wished to do exactly what the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] wishes to do, save and preserve completely unimpaired the rights of the Federal Government with reference to the development of water power by the construction of dams; and that the committee again called in to assist and advise it in reaching that end the very man who should know most about it, the same man who had sat in during the wording of this particular subsection during earlier Congresses, and who told the committee that something new had been included, something that he did not like; and thereupon the committee struck it out, so as to leave this particular section in such form that Mr. Gatchell could approve it. It was only after striking out those words that the committee itself approved the section.

I think we should not reach a conclusion which would lead to the unfair belief that the committee has not gone to the very bottom of the matter, for actually the committee has done so by calling in to assist it the most able persons who could assist it in drawing up this proposed legislation. Thus it appears that after the earlier sessions of the committee, Mr. Gatchell was called back—as he had also been called back in earlier years—to express his opinion as to whether the Federal Power Commission was in this field amply protected.

I believe the best answer to satisfy completely the distinguished Senator from Montana in this field is that the approval of the Federal Power Commission has been given.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I return to my original point, because I believe it is so important that the Senate realize that the adoption of this amendment would leave the doctrine of paramount right completely unrestrained and completely unlimited and all inclusive. It would leave the Congress in the position of expressing the feeling that the filling of lands along the shore would be a diminution of the power of the United States to defend these waters; it might leave the record as indicating that the Congress felt that no proper use of fisheries or no possible use of the sand, gravel, and the other assets to be found in these waters could be made that would not adversely affect the United States in its control of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs.

We think this Congress, above everything else, does want to leave its opinion carefully engraved on the public annals of this Nation to the effect that we do not like this unrestricted, unlimited doctrine of paramount rights; we see in it a danger to private and to public property throughout the Nation; we see in it the restrictive power of the Federal Government against the continued normal development of our Nation along its 5,000 miles of coastline, just as we have seen that development halted since the 1947 decision in the California case; and we want to leave this measure in such condition that the world, in looking, can see that we are of the opinion that there are in this coastal belt many property rights which can be used for

the good of States and for the good of individuals and for the good of the Nation, without in any sense impairing or encroaching upon the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the performance of its important constitutional duties.

Mr. President, it seems to me that some of our friends who are opposing the pending measure put themselves in the position of indicating that they feel that we are trying to alienate these lands, that we are trying to grant them to some foreign power. To the contrary, I remind them, the States are parts of the Union, and anything the States develop adds to the wealth of the Nation, anything the States use that can be administered locally can be administered under sounder principles of democratic government than if we were to require the setting up of a huge bureaucratic agency at the National Capital in order to administer the uses in question, which so vitally affect all property, public and private, along the coastline of our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator from Florida have expired.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will yield for a question, and then ask that the time be considered as added. However, I am ready to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 66 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida know of any instance in which the exercise of this concept of ownership by the States of soils beneath navigable waters, either inland or seaward, has in any way conflicted with the exercise of the paramount governmental powers of the Federal Government?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know of such an instance, and he would say that he does not believe there ever could be such a conflict, because the Federal Government has the control of every use of this belt which affects directly its ability to carry out its duty to the Nation in the fields of navigation, commerce, defense, and international relations. We cannot impair that ability. We do not want to impair it. We are here to serve the Nation in its necessary fields and in the subserving of its necessary jurisdiction, just as we are trying to subserve the interests of the States and of tens of thousands of private individuals whose money is invested in industries and in properties which are affected adversely by the three Supreme Court decisions, and which will be affected so helpfully by the passage of the pending measure.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not highly significant that, throughout this long fight, not one instance has ever been pointed out by the opposition in which the subordinate proprietary rights of the States have conflicted with any of the governmental powers which the Federal Government wanted to exercise in international affairs, national defense, flood control, commerce, and so forth?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course; it is very significant that not a single instance has been pointed out in which the activities

of the States, or of private individuals acting under the States, have conflicted with the important responsibilities of the Federal Government. Furthermore, the pending measure would not in any sense open the door to any conflict in those fields in the future. The pending measure would safeguard to the Nation and to the people of the Nation the rights, privileges, duties, powers, and jurisdiction of the Federal Government within the necessary fields in which the Federal Government can best act.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida, in order that I may ask him a few questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to accept the offer of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may do as he has suggested.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida has stated that not a single instance has been uncovered wherein the Federal Government has been deprived of rights or has suffered interference with respect to any of its rights, including the right to go upon streams and to construct dams and other structures. Of course, that is entirely correct, but what we are fearful of is that the pending measure, if passed in its present form and containing its present language, would have that effect. The Senator has spoken with great eloquence about his fear of the claim of paramount rights by the Federal Government within the respective States, and I desire to point out that, throughout the hearings, and ever since this subject has been before the Senate, opponents of the legislation have always repudiated the idea that they were intending to claim, or were trying to claim, that the Government had ownership or paramount rights with respect to the streams or inland bodies of water. I think it was made perfectly clear by the testimony in the hearings, and by repeated statements on the floor of the Senate, that we were not attempting to claim anything of that nature, but we are fearful, nevertheless, that under the language of the pending measure, an effort might be made to write a new definition of the doctrine of the navigability of rivers which would have the effect of depriving the Federal Government of the right to go upon the navigable rivers for the purpose of carrying out programs for the development of Federal works on them.

I notice that in section 7 of the pending measure there has not been included the language of the Federal Power Act of 1920, which contains a definition of the navigability of our rivers. I cannot understand why that language of the act was eliminated, or was not included within section 7, if it is true that there is no intention of writing a new definition of navigability of the rivers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I can reassure the distinguished Senator from Montana on that point.

The reason why the specific exemption of the Federal Power Act was not placed in the joint resolution at the particular place designated by him, namely, in section 7, is because the Federal Power Commission and its advisers had been before the various committees, and had asked to be fully protected by the inclusion of subsection (d) of section 3, and also by another provision relative to waters, which is found in another subsection of section 3, which we do not need to discuss here, unless the distinguished Senator desires that we do so. But they had two requests to make, which they thought would completely protect their jurisdiction; and those requests have been written into the language of the pending measure, and have been retained.

In the drafting of the final measure by the committee, the committee members asserted again that they desired certain language as requested by the Federal Power Commission, and that language is now contained in the pending measure. They did not want it included at the place to which the Senator has adverted. At that particular place, in section 7, there is a blanket reservation to the effect that nothing in the joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal certain other acts. The Senator from Florida would have to refer to his notes in order to state what all those acts are, but the principal ones are the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the Flood Control Act of 1944; and there is included not only the reservation of those 2 acts, but also of all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

The Senator from Florida states again that, if we cannot rely upon the statement of the Federal Power Commissioners themselves, and their learned professional adviser, as to when they are fully protected, then we are in a difficult position in trying to serve our Nation. The Senator from Florida is willing to rely upon that advice.

Mr. MURRAY. But it would seem to me that somewhere in the joint resolution there should be some reference to the Federal Power Act, if it is to remain in full force and effect, and is not to be modified in any respect as a result of the passage of the pending joint resolution. If a new definition of navigability is not to be written, it seems to me it ought to be clearly stated in the pending measure in some fashion, so that it would be recognized at a mere glance; but it is difficult to understand the language when it is obscured by provisions which grant, in the first instance, ownership to the States of the beds of the inland waters, and then provide that the Federal Government shall have the right to enter upon the premises for the purpose of constructing works of the character about which we have been talking. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in subsequent sections there is taken away from the Federal Government the real power and authority to enter upon the riverbeds for the purpose of carrying on the activities which we have been discussing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's comment. It is

the opinion of the Senator from Florida, based upon a great deal of study in this field, and based also upon what he regards as the soundest advice that has been procurable, which is the advice of the professional staff of the Federal Power Commission, that that Commission, in all fields of its jurisdiction that would be affected by the pending measure, is completely protected. If the Senator has a request from the Federal Power Commission for some additional words, the Senator from Florida certainly would be glad to go along with anything which, in the opinion of that Commission, would give it fuller protection. The Senator from Florida is not trying to strike down, he is trying to build a sounder structure. I think the Senator from Montana knows that that is the case. So, if the Senator from Montana has any expression from the Federal Power Commission, or any request by the Commission for additional words to be included in the pending measure, the Senator from Florida would be very glad to consider it, and believes he would be able to cooperate fully in accomplishing the result desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 75 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to take up any more time on the part of the proponents of the amendment. It already has been discussed very fully, both by myself and by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. As a result of the debate we have had this afternoon many explanations and concessions have been made, and it seems to me we have covered the situation as fully as can be expected. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily by speaking further, unless we are going to be able to accomplish something. The statements and clarifications which have already been made are in the RECORD, and I do not think I care to add anything to them. Unless the Senator from Florida has further remarks to make, I should be willing to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to cooperate, but I remember that our mutual friend, the Senator from Oregon, asked to be heard further. I shall be willing to yield him time out of the time I have remaining, and I am sure the Senator from Montana is willing to do the same thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is not present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the sponsors of the pending amendment to

the committee amendment are satisfied, as the result of the debate that has taken place during the day, there has been considerable clarification of the question involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Montana, I am not going to discuss that amendment further, but shall await a further amendment in order to make the comments I was going to make in answer to the Senator from Florida, because I have no intention of technically violating the rules.

I merely wish to say, good naturedly, that I have not begun to speak as many times on various phases of the joint resolution as has the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a result of the debate this afternoon, I believe the legislative intent with respect to the pending amendment to the committee amendment has been very clearly established. Therefore, I suggest that permission be granted to withdraw the amendment, so as not to take up the time of the Senate to vote upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment at any time.

Mr. MURRAY. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I did not understand the Presiding Officer. It was my understanding that we would have an opportunity to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I do not understand how we have reached this point so rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no definite time was set for a vote on that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, I had a misunderstanding. I could talk until the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] returned to the floor. Often a vote is delayed by a unanimous-consent agreement. I think there is no disposition to deprive Senators of opportunities to present amendments. I had hoped to present amendments this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair called for further amendments to the committee amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Presiding Officer was entirely correct in asking if there were further amendments. We were a little slow in presenting them. I ask the indulgence of the Chair, because the Senator from Florida has a short amendment, and other Senators may have short amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have a clarifying amendment on the table. I do not have a copy of it before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think it will involve any debate at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 6, after "Union" it is proposed to insert the following: "(otherwise than by a general retention or cession of lands underlying the marginal sea)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. If any Senator wishes an explanation of this amendment I shall be very glad to explain it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator think it would be a good idea to make a brief explanation?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very glad to see the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in the Chamber. Senators are well aware of the fact that when it came to the wording of that part of the joint resolution which related to exceptions with respect to Federal property, the Department of Justice felt that some additional provisions were necessary to make it completely clear that everything the Federal Government might have developed and of which it was making use was definitely excepted. Of course, the sponsors of the joint resolution were in complete accord with that idea. So the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, handling the legislation ably, as he did, as chairman of the subcommittee, suggested a drafting by the Department of Justice of wording which it might prefer. That wording was gone over by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Oregon.

At any rate, section 5, including all the subsections, represents the final collective work of all concerned—I am sure that there was no division in the committee on this—in the effort to try to safeguard the United States in every possible way, with respect to any property of any sort which it actually occupies or has developed, or is using. The wording of section 5 represents the result of that effort.

This problem was submitted to the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress. The Senate legislative counsel suggested words similar to those included in the pending amendment. That wording was submitted to the Department of Justice. It came back in the form of a letter to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Florida, rewritten somewhat, but with these specific words suggested as the words which would negative any idea that all the exclusions together in this section would nullify the principal intent of the joint resolution, which is to confirm to the States the assets and resources in the lands underlying the marginal sea and out to their seaward boundaries.

I am sure that Senators will realize that this amendment is clarifying, and

I hope that it may be agreed to without further discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF FARRANT LEWIS TURNER TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, acting for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska], I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the present consideration of the nomination of Farrant Lewis Turner to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Farrant Lewis Turner to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed as in executive session; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "affect" and in lieu thereof insert the word "diminish" and at the end of section 9, in line 16, strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That leases for the development of the natural resources of the Continental Shelf herein described shall be offered only by competitive bid under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: And provided further, That the revenues derived from such leasing and from royalties on production deriving therefrom shall be paid into a special fund in the United States Treasury and shall be available for appropriations only for distribution among the several States of the United States for the benefit of the common schools of said States on the basis of the number of children of school age in the respective States as established by the latest decennial census."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, 150 years ago today the papers for the Louisiana Purchase were signed. Today is the 150th anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France. My

State of South Dakota is one of a number of States which were carved out of the Louisiana Territory.

In 1811 the State of Louisiana was authorized, by act of Congress approved February 20, 1811. It was an act to enable the people of the Territory of Orleans to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, and so forth. That act decided the boundaries of the prospective State of Louisiana. The important part of that description, so far as this discussion is concerned, is that when it came to the Gulf of Mexico the boundary of Louisiana on the south was described in this manner:

Thence bounded by the said Gulf to the place of beginning, including all islands within 3 leagues of the coast.

It is to be noted that the Territory of Orleans, authorized to form a State of the Union, extended only to the Gulf. The islands were added, out to 3 leagues from the coast, but there was no suggestion that any part of the Gulf itself was to become a part of the State of Louisiana.

That fact was further confirmed in the act of admission of the State of Louisiana on April 8, 1812. The first act was the enabling act. The second act was the act for the admission, April 8, 1812. There again the same language was used—

Thence bounded by the said Gulf to the place of beginning.

In other words, as nearly as I can understand the language from a layman's point of view, the State of Louisiana was cut off at the Gulf of Mexico on the south.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I shall be very glad to yield a little later. I should like to proceed for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. CASE. By various acts of the Congress during succeeding years the Territory of Louisiana to the north of what became the State of Louisiana was cut off and divided into a number of States.

Before the enabling act with respect to South Dakota was passed on the 2d of March 1861, there was passed an act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Dakota. Then there was passed an enabling act for the creation of the States of North Dakota and South Dakota out of Dakota Territory, and South Dakota was admitted to the Union in 1889. Section 14 of the Enabling Act of South Dakota reads, as follows:

Sec. 14. That the lands granted to the Territories of Dakota and Montana by the act of February 18, 1881, entitled "An act to grant lands to Dakota, Montana, Arizona, Idaho, and Wyoming for university purposes," are hereby vested in the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, respectively, if such States are admitted into the Union as provided in this act, to the extent of the full quantity of 72 sections to each of said States, and any portion of said lands that may not have been selected by either of said Territories of Dakota or Montana may be selected by the respective States aforesaid; but said act of February 18, 1881, shall be so amended as to provide that none of said lands shall be sold for less than \$10 per acre, and the pro-

ceeds shall constitute a permanent fund to be safely invested and held by said States severally, and the income thereof be used exclusively for university purposes.

Therefore, section 14 established an endowment of certain lands for universities in the Territories which became States. Other sections provided for other educational institutions and the common schools. Section 11 carried a blanket condition to all of them, as follows:

SEC. 11. That all lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be disposed of only at public sale, and at a price not less than \$10 per acre, the proceeds to constitute a permanent school fund, the interest of which only shall be expended in the support of said schools. But said lands may, under such regulations as the legislatures shall prescribe, be leased for periods of not more than 5 years, in quantities not exceeding 1 section to any 1 person or company; and such land shall not be subject to preemption, homestead entry, or any other entry, under the land laws of the United States, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, but shall be reserved for school purposes only.

Mr. President, that is the kind of vision which Congress had in the days when it was setting aside lands for the endowment of common schools, colleges, and universities in territories which were being made into States.

It seems to me that there is just a little irony in the fact that on this 150th anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory the Senate should be turning down all proposals to make out of the last great public domain, the Continental Shelf, any reservation of lands for educational purposes.

In the days when there was vision in this country, when we thought about the future and when we thought more about doing something for education than about satisfying the desires of people interested in oil leases, Congress did not hesitate to allocate some lands for the benefit of education. And in 1862, Congress did not hesitate when it passed the Morrill Act, which President Lincoln signed, to establish a basis upon which land-grant colleges could be established and on which basis they have prospered since that time.

In this day it seems to me it is a shame, on the 150th anniversary of the acquisition of Louisiana Territory, that with respect to the last part of that territory which can be considered to be public domain, nothing is being done to preserve an endowment for education.

If it were possible to take the Continental Shelf, Mr. President, and allocate a portion of it to the individual States, perhaps that would be the best way to do it. That would avoid any suggestion that the Federal Government was seeking control over education in any way, but there seems no practical way to accomplish that except by allocation of the revenues.

In the prior division of the public domain in these territories, which were carved out of the Louisiana Purchase, the Federal Government was able to make an allocation of specific lands within that territory to the States, and that solved the problem of making an allocation to the States.

Obviously the Continental Shelf is so situated geographically that it would be difficult to make an allocation out of that last part of the public domain in the Louisiana Territory and make assignment of it to the several States in the Union equitably.

So it seemed that the one way in which the purpose could be accomplished would be to provide that the revenues derived from the development of minerals in the Continental Shelf be put into a pool, and to provide that the pool shall be distributed purely on a per capita basis among the States for the benefit of the children of school age in the several States. This device should prevent the Federal Government from any form of control over education within the States, since the funds would be distributed purely on a per capita basis.

That is the purpose of the amendment which I have offered. The amendment does not, I may say, affect the controversy which has taken place with regard to the boundaries of the States, namely, whether they shall be 3 miles on the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean and 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico. The amendment accepts the definitions in the joint resolution with reference to the boundaries, as they may be presumed to be set out by the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

However, the amendment does provide that, as to the Continental Shelf, the revenues from the Continental Shelf "shall be paid into a special fund in the United States Treasury, and shall be available for appropriation only for distribution among the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia for the benefit of the common schools of said States and Territories on the basis of the number of children of school age in the respective States and Territories as established by the latest decennial census."

Mr. President, we all recognize that there comes a time in the consideration of a measure when a psychological state has developed when Senators, either by statement, commitment, or vote, have indicated or developed a certain trend of thought, at which point it is more or less useless to present further amendments.

I am not sure, Mr. President, but that time may have arrived. There are as many Members on the floor as there have been for a great deal of the debate, but the Senator from South Dakota recognizes it would be expecting too much to expect Senators who are not in the Chamber to come in and vote on this amendment differently than in the pattern already developed, even though there are some differences in the text and mechanics.

However, at least for the RECORD I should like to indicate the possibilities of approaching the subject from a different angle. It is not necessary to go into all the details which have been proposed in some of the other amendments, in order to provide that the Continental Shelf could be administered for the benefit of education. I have tried to do it in the simplest way possible. I appreciate the statement which was made by the distinguished majority leader, the

Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is the spokesman for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the handling of the joint resolution, wherein both Senators have promised that within a few weeks there will be presented to the Senate a bill which will go into great detail and spell out management for the Continental Shelf. I have welcomed the record as they have made it, to the effect that it is their belief that all of the Continental Shelf belongs to the United States as a whole.

However, it did seem to me that we could make sure of some action at this time in the pending joint resolution by the first proviso of my amendment, which reads:

Provided, That leases for the development of the natural resources of the Continental Shelf herein described shall be offered only by competitive bid under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Admittedly that places in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior considerable authority and power, but it does set up the specific condition that the leases shall be offered only by competitive bid and under the premise we have already had stated, namely, that details will be spelled out for administration by the Secretary of the Interior or by another governmental agency in the bill promised. This would insure a method by which the Continental Shelf could be prospected and leased until we actually set up some other form or detail of administration.

The second proviso reads:

Provided further, That the revenues derived from such leasing and from royalties or production deriving therefrom shall be paid into a special fund in the United States Treasury and shall be available for appropriation only for distribution among the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia for the benefit of the common schools of said States and Territories on the basis of the number of children of school age in the respective States and Territories as established by the latest decennial census.

During the debate, Mr. President, there have been times when it has been suggested that any proposal to utilize these revenues for education might be socialistic. However, most of the States of the Union have endowment lands for the benefit of education. In a memorandum which I believe has been distributed to all Senators' desks, I have listed the States which have endowment lands for education, lands from which the revenue is dedicated for the purposes of education. That list of names is taken from the tables which appear in the hearings on the joint resolution at, I believe, pages 396 and following. Those States are Alabama, Alaska Territory, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota,

Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. President, all these areas do not regard it as socialistic that they should have some endowment lands whose proceeds are dedicated purely for purposes of education.

As I also have pointed out in the memorandum, President Abraham Lincoln, who was a pretty fair sort of Republican, was the one who signed the first Federal grant to education bill, namely, the Morrill Act, in 1862.

My amendment does not propose to have Federal control of education in any way. My amendment simply provides for Continental Shelf endowment lands for the common schools of the Nation, and provides for a per capita distribution on the basis of the number of children of school age in each State.

It seems to me that if we wish to do something to make this joint resolution remembered by the people of the United States, we should put into the joint resolution a provision which would do something for all the States, rather than provide special treatment for a few of the States.

The landmarks in legislative progress are not, Mr. President, the bills which take care of a few States or a few special interests. The landmarks in legislative progress are the acts which do something for the common good.

Mr. President, I submit that we now have an opportunity, on this anniversary of the signing for the Louisiana Purchase, to do something constructive for all the States and for the school children of the Nation for all time to come, by making a reservation of the last public domain in the Louisiana Purchase, by dedicating the revenues from it to the benefit of the common schools of the country.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Is he pressing for a vote on his amendment at this time?

Mr. CASE. I assume the amendment will be voted on in due course. I thought there would be more debate on it. My request for the yeas and nays will probably depend upon what interest develops and upon how the situation appears.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was not sure whether the Senator from South Dakota was going to press for adoption of his amendment, but now I understand that he has stated he is doing so.

Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for a question at this time?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota provides aid only for the common schools. Certainly I am strongly in favor of providing aid for them.

However, the Senator from South Dakota knows that much of the evidence presented before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and much of the evidence presented to the Senate itself shows a very compelling need on the part of certain of the higher-educational institutions, and that many of

them are confronted really by very great crises. The evidence also shows the great need for more doctors, more engineers, more scientists, more physicists, and more technicians of all kinds.

So, inasmuch as even if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota becomes law, it will have to be implemented by subsequent legislation, I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota will be willing to modify his amendment in such a way as to provide for aid for both primary, secondary, and higher educational institutions.

I do not know whether the Senator from South Dakota was able to be in the Chamber the other day when there was submitted what I regarded as some very telling testimony from the head of the National Science Foundation and the head of the National Council of Engineers, and from representatives of other distinguished scientific organizations, as to the need, from the standpoint of the national defense, for additional engineers, additional chemists, additional scientists, additional doctors—in short, additional graduates of all kinds from the higher institutions of learning.

So I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota will be willing to modify his amendment by including phraseology which at least will make the institutions of higher education eligible to receive some of the funds.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that question submitted. I reply by saying that, first of all, I was seeking to have an amendment by which we would not get into the question of the control over the use of the funds by the States, but whereby we would simply make a per capita distribution on the basis of the children of school age.

I also recognized that if, perchance, the amendment should be adopted, it would go to conference with the House of Representatives, and it would be possible there to spell out the purposes a little more fully, if that were desired.

My second thought was that if we could have the amendment adopted on the simplest possible terms, even if the aid were limited to the common schools of the States, that in itself would relieve the burden on the treasuries of the common school districts, and also would lessen the demands within the States for supplemental appropriations for education, with the result that the revenues which otherwise would normally be applied to the common schools, could be applied to the specific purposes the Senator from Alabama has in mind.

Of course the Senator from Alabama is familiar with the operations of the Bankhead-Jones Act. He will recall that when it was proposed that 25 percent of the revenues from the land-utilization projects be made available for return to the States for school and road purposes, there were many Members of Congress who wanted the money to go into the general fund. Other acts provide that 25 percent of the revenues from the forests be available for school and road purposes. Some persons have thought that these restrictions should be lifted; but the answer always has been, "Well, those are purposes which everyone recognizes as being very desirable ones; and if the money is made

available for school purposes, that will relieve the general drain upon the counties for other purposes, so in the long run it will be six of one and half a dozen of the other."

Mr. HILL. Let me inquire why would not the Senator from South Dakota agree to have the money be given in grants in aid to other institutions and for other educational purposes, having in mind that some of the funds might go to the National Science Foundation?

The Senator from South Dakota has been most helpful in the battle to have the funds derived from the resources of the submerged lands dedicated to the cause of education. Those who have been interested have thought in terms of providing support for the higher educational institutions, as well as for educational institutions in the lower grades.

I believe the Senator from South Dakota would strengthen his amendment very much, and I believe his amendment would accomplish the purpose we have been seeking to accomplish, if he would agree to modify his amendment in the way I have suggested.

Of course, there would have to be subsequent legislation, anyway, I am sure, in order to implement this provision.

So I hope the Senator from South Dakota will agree to modify his amendment in such a way as to have it provide for grants-in-aid to both primary, secondary, and higher education. I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota will agree to modify his amendment in that way.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to talk about that matter with the Senator from Alabama if additional time is available by reason of any subsequent debate; but I may say frankly that my attempt was to get the amendment in the simplest possible form, with the thought that there might be a little better chance of its adoption if we did not go into too many ramifications and if we did not get it so complex that it would be susceptible of different interpretations.

All along, when we have spoken of any kind of Federal aid to education, the opposition has suggested once we provide Federal funds for education we get into the question of Federal control over education. Then we get into the question of formulae and details of this sort, and the effort bogs down.

I was trying to get the amendment in the simplest possible form, in the hope that we might be able to get a little more favorable consideration.

As the Senator from Alabama knows, I have voted for all amendments involving education which have been offered, even though some other parts of the amendments might not have been exactly in the form in which I thought they should be drawn. I grew up in a State where it was not a disgrace, it was not socialistic, to provide a little aid to education. The enabling act of South Dakota set aside certain lands for educational purposes. Our State legislature, which recently adjourned, appropriated funds belonging to the State as a whole for the aid of certain common-school districts in the State. Some districts in the State do not have a very high tax base. The State legislature also distrib-

utes, on the basis of the school census, the income from our endowment land, so that every school child has an equal right in it. That is the kind of principle which was invoked for the common schools of the State which I now have the honor in part to represent. I have thought that principle might be applied in the case of the pending measure. As the Senator may remember, it was brought out recently during the debate that the figure the State of South Dakota has in Statuary Hall in this Capitol is a memorial to Gen. William Henry Harrison Beadle, because he saved the school lands, not only for South Dakota, but for the States of Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and North Dakota as well. He was the author of the sections of the law I read at the outset of my remarks, which protected the school-endowment lands, providing that they should never be sold for less than \$10 an acre. That is why we have an endowment for education in those States today. My amendment seeks to apply the same principle to the last public domain in the Louisiana Territory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield, let me say that I appreciate the Senator's carrying on in that very fine and great tradition today in his strong advocacy of the dedication to educational purposes of funds from the resources of the submerged lands.

If the Senator from South Dakota will yield further, I should like to call his attention to the fact that only day before yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to a statement made by Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, to the House Committee on Appropriations, of which, I believe, the Senator from South Dakota was a member when he was in the House. Dr. Waterman, only a few days ago, made this statement:

In the year 1955 the estimate is that 50,000 engineering graduates will be produced in the Soviet Union, compared to some 17,000 in the United States. A similar situation exists in the United States with respect to the production of trained scientists of all types.

At that time, I submitted to the Senate, as did other Senators, much evidence along the same line, showing the present great need for engineers, scientists, chemists, and physicists; and I know that today there is also a shortage of doctors. I hope the Senator will be willing to modify his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota will confer with the Senator from Alabama further on that point, but he again points out that, if we could provide that the revenues in question shall be dedicated to the common schools, it would relieve the demand upon other revenues, revenues which, in turn, could become available for the specific institutions of higher learning in many of the States.

Mr. President, how much time have I consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I should like to reserve the remainder of my time. For the present I yield the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I had requested the Senator from Florida to control, on my behalf, the allocation of time, so I now ask him to yield me 10 or 15 minutes, and perhaps a little more.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the pending amendment is like three others that have been offered, in that it presents another approach to providing for the administration of the outer Continental Shelf. Each and all of the suggested approaches represent a job only half done.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY UNCONTROLLED

The amendment now before us, Mr. President, does not even provide for the validation of existing leases, even those under which there is production today. It provides no procedure for exploration by which lands not now known to contain oil might be explored to determine whether they contain oil. It would make the Secretary of the Interior a complete dictator of the area comprising the lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

The jurisdiction and control of the United States proclaimed in the proclamation of 1945 can obviously, Mr. President, be exercised only through law. The pending amendment, were it to be adopted as a part of the pending measure, would be the sole provision of law applicable to that area; and the sole grant of authority contained in the amendment is a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior, in these words:

That leases for the development of the natural resources of the Continental Shelf herein described shall be offered only by competitive bid, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

That is all it says.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Does not the Senator from Oregon plan to bring to the floor of the Senate within about 2 weeks a legislative proposal which will spell out in detail the method and manner in which the Secretary of the Interior shall operate?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from South Dakota is, I am sure, aware of the statements made by the Senator from Oregon in that field, and that is the very reason the Senator from Oregon is now on his feet, calling attention to the glaring and obvious shortcomings of the particular amendment now pending. It is wholly inadvisable, wifolly temporary, and wholly ineffective for performing any service whatever, with respect to the Continental Shelf, for the people of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for another question?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will yield for another question.

Mr. CASE. First, did the Senator from Oregon hear the Senator from South Dakota describe this amendment as a stopgap provision, so far as the Secretary of the Interior is concerned, and so far as the mechanism proposed for handling leases is concerned?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon listened to the discussion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota thought he used the term "stopgap."

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not quite recall that particular usage, but the Senator from South Dakota, who is sincere in all the things he does, and wholly frank, could have used the language; and the Senator from Oregon would have expected him to use it.

Mr. CASE. Although I have frankly regarded the provision as a "stopgap," I do not accept the idea that it would be wholly useless. If it were a stopgap, it would at least be a guaranty that there would not be any leasing, except by competitive bidding, until the matured, detailed, and worthwhile provisions of the bill on which the Senator from Oregon is working are brought before the Senate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, were there going to be some considerable time lag, months or years, stopgap legislation might well be considered. But even stopgap legislation ought to be effective. In this instance we are asked to enact stopgap legislation for a period of certainly not more than a few weeks.

Mr. President, the amendment would be wholly ineffective. Were its terms such as to make it effective, its practical application would be impossible within the time between the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13, which we hope will be passed on Tuesday next, and the bringing before the Senate of a reasonably well-considered bill with reference to the subject. There will not be time, Mr. President, for the Secretary of the Interior even to compile his regulations for administering the area. There will not be time for the Secretary of the Interior to get from his Solicitor a well-considered legal opinion as to what the Secretary could do under the amendment.

IMMEDIATE CHANGE WOULD BE REQUIRED

There would not be within that period of time any opportunity to do anything constructive under the amendment. The only result of the amendment, so far as I can see, would be that it would require one more provision in a measure that would constitute a title III which would have to provide for the amendment or repeal of the stopgap legislation. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, it does not appear at all advisable to place this sort of stopgap amendment in the pending joint resolution.

I listened particularly carefully to the Senator from South Dakota, and I want to say that there is no Member of this body who is more sincere, who is a harder worker, or a better worker than is the Senator from South Dakota. No one who has ever been on the floor in my time has had a deeper interest in

public-school education in this country than has the Senator from South Dakota. I am not intending in anywise to offer any criticism of the Senator. I disagree with him in some respects. I seldom disagree with him at all, but I do disagree with him in some respects at this time.

I would oppose the amendment upon the very ground that the Senator from South Dakota offers it, that of a school endowment. I do not take the view which some persons evidently have, according to the Senator from South Dakota, that the endowment idea would be a step toward socialism. I do believe, Mr. President, that the danger to our public-school system would be grave, were we to provide an aid-to-education fund with strings attached to it, thus giving the Federal Government in Washington control over our schools. My position is the same whether that centralized Federal control would be exercised by the Congress, or by the Executive or Administrative branch of the Government.

PATENTING OF LANDS TO STATE-PROTECTED SCHOOLS

One of the most important decisions of all time in this country was made when aid to common schools was predicated upon the granting by patent to the States as they came into the Union of lands for use in aid of education. When that was done, Mr. President, it established a precedent which I hope we shall never abandon—the precedent of making a grant which was final and complete and with respect to which there was no authority left in the Federal Government. We then protected our school system from any Federal control, and placed it within the States themselves. It should forever remain there and be forever alienated from any Federal control.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. The principle which the Senator has just enunciated I would deem desirable, and if I knew how to protect the Continental Shelf and allocate portions of it to individual States and sever all Federal connections, I should be very glad to have that done. But I do not know how it can be done. The Federal Government has certain tracts in some of the so-called public lands States.

I realize there is no purpose in pressing for a vote this afternoon, under the circumstances, and I am wondering whether, if I should withdraw the amendment, I might have the assurance of the Senator from Oregon that in the consideration of the detailed bill in connection with the Continental Shelf which he has promised the Senate will be forthcoming, opportunity can be given for me to appear before his committee to present the idea of dedication of the revenues to education and be assured of a hearing before the Senator's committee. If that can be done, I shall be glad to withdraw my amendment at this time.

Mr. CORDON. I do not want in any way, Mr. President, to try to persuade the Senator from South Dakota to with-

draw his amendment, and I am sure the Senator does not intend that. However, I do desire to offer to the Senator from South Dakota and to any others of my colleagues an invitation to appear before the Senate Interior Committee, bringing any light possible upon the subject and any suggestions they may desire to bring. The committee has worked hard on this matter, but its members would, I am sure, agree with the acting chairman that the Committee does not know everything there is to know about the subject.

The Senator from South Dakota will be most welcome, whether or not he withdraws his amendment. That question should be left to the sound discretion of the Senator.

OIL IN SOUTH DAKOTA

I should like to suggest to the Senator that in all probability, according to the press, it will be almost no time at all until the big oil pool in North Dakota will be spreading down into South Dakota, and that presently that lovely section of the Louisiana Purchase will be bubbling oil the revenues from which will be available for all the various needs of the Senator's home State. I join in a most fervent hope that the Senator's State will be blessed by the discovery of oil in quantities in South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the expression of hope by the Senator from Oregon. The people of South Dakota have so hoped for a long time. There is oil in Wyoming, to the west of South Dakota; there is oil in North Dakota, to the north of South Dakota; and there is oil south of us, but, so far, no commercial oil wells have been developed in South Dakota. As the Bible says, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I appreciate the very kind wishes of the Senator from Oregon and the very kind remarks he has made. If it is in order at this time, I wish to withdraw my amendment and I shall avail myself of the invitation of the Senator from Oregon to appear before his committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota withdraws his amendment.

The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4-27-53-D and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 14, after the word "coast", it is proposed to insert "of the main continent" and in line 16, after the word "waters," to insert a comma and "and in the case of any island seaward of such coast, means the line of ordinary low water around such island."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to clear up an ambiguity in the pending joint resolution and to conform to what the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] the author of the joint resolution, stated was its real intention.

One of the problems connected with the joint resolution is the problem of where the base line is, from which the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark are to be measured. Senate Joint Resolution 13 defines this location as the "coastline," but it is not precisely certain in my mind or in the mind of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] whose interpretation I requested, what is meant by the word "coastline." In the main debate on the joint resolution, I pointed out that this definition might mean 1 of 2 things. First, it might mean, what I hoped it would mean; namely, the shoreline of the main continental land mass and the external limits of inland waters; and then, in the case of islands, the shorelines of each of those islands.

But I pointed out that probably there would be a contrary claim, particularly in the case of California, and that an attempt would be made to define the term "coastline" as being a line drawn from the main continent out to and along the outer edge of the outer islands lying off the coast. This is a tremendously important subject. It involves very substantial areas, particularly in the case of California. If it is the latter definition which is to be used, then the water between the remote islands—however far out—and the main continental land mass would become inland waters, not external waters, and all the intervening submerged lands would become the property of the coastal State.

The purpose of this amendment is to nail down the definition of "coastline," so as to have it apply to the shoreline of the main continental mass and the external limits of inland waters; and then, in the case of islands, to have it start, in the case of each island, at the low-water mark on shoreline of each island.

In the debate on this subject, the very eminent Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], at page 2756 of the RECORD, under date of April 7, in response to my question, said that under the joint resolution no such contention could be advanced as that the shoreline would be measured from the outer line of the chain of islands lying far off the coast of the continental land mass. I shall take the Senator from Florida at his word in submitting this amendment, which will tie down this subject, fix the coastline more definitely and exclude the possibility of claims he has declared he did not intend to confirm.

I may say that, although the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is not at this moment on the floor, I informed him a few minutes ago of my intention to offer this amendment. Therefore, I have tried to conform to the standards of the Senate in giving advance notice.

It should be recalled that the State of California in 1949, as the junior Senator from California accurately stated, attempted to define the boundary line of California as being a line 3 miles out from the seaward shoreline of the farthest islands lying off the coast. But if a situation should be permitted to develop which would allow State legislatures to define what their coastline is in such expansive terms, then we shall

be confronted with an infinite amount of trouble, extensive litigation, and also with a very great loss of territory and revenue to the Federal Government. How extensive this area is in the case of California can readily be seen from a quick glance at the map. San Clemente and San Nicolas Islands are nearly 60 miles off the main continent. Thousands of square miles of submerged lands are included in this area. The resources are incalculable. If the sponsors of the joint resolution do not intend to cede the ownership of this great area to California, why do we not say so, as this amendment does?

If it is desired to diminish litigation, which is allegedly one of the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 13, and if we desire to make certain our meaning, I sincerely hope that my amendment will be agreed to.

I observe that the very able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], whom we are delighted to have as a Member of this body, and who is an ornament to our ranks, is now on the floor.

I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] 10 minutes, or as much time as he may require.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I can understand the argument made by the Senator from Illinois, but I believe his amendment completely fails to reach the objective he is striving to achieve.

If one examines the testimony of the representative of the Department of State, he will see that it is the position of the State Department of the present administration, as it was also the position of the previous administration, and, so far as I know, of all other administrations, that the marginal sea begins wherever the line of inland waters ends. That is a very simple position to take in the case of a straight coast line, as is the situation with regard to the State of Texas. There the shore line and the coast line are synonymous in almost all instances.

However, the situation becomes more complicated when we consider a coast having many indentures, islands, sounds, coves, bays, and the like. At present there is a difference of opinion between the State governments and the Federal Government as to precisely where the line of inland waters is located. But it is well agreed, as it has always been agreed, that the marginal sea begins at the point where the line of inland waters ends.

I should like to apply that definition to the State of Louisiana. I regret that I do not have here a map of Louisiana for the purpose of demonstrating my point, but all who have made a study of the question agree that a body of water known as Chandeleur Sound is inland water. In that area there is a large number of islands, each island close to another. It is agreed by both the Federal Government and the State government, and it has always been agreed, that Chandeleur Sound is inland water. The effect of the Douglas amendment would be to make Chandeleur Sound a part of the high seas, although the Fed-

eral Government has never contended that Chandeleur Sound was a part of the high seas, and the State government has always claimed it was inland water.

Likewise, in the case of bays, it is the position of the State Department that bays not wider than 10 miles are inland waters. The distance of 10 miles between headlands across the mouth of a bay marks the place where the marginal sea begins. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would have the effect once again of declaring such a bay to be a part of the high seas, merely because it is wider than 6 miles between headlands.

Obviously, the Senator from Illinois is submitting his own definition of inland waters. In effect, it is a definition of inland waters which does not have the support of a single State government in the United States; it does not have the support of the State Department; it is a definition that does not meet with the approval of the Department of Justice; it is a definition, in effect, that does not meet with the approval of a single department of either the Federal Government or the State governments.

There is no authority for accepting the inference of this amendment, namely, that the definition of inland waters is that they begin at the shore line or where 3-mile lines from headlands intersect in a bay. There is no support for this type of amendment, other than that it appeals to the Senator from Illinois.

The committee has struggled with this problem. The committee struggled with several different formulas for defining inland waters. Originally, the joint resolution provided that inland waters should include all bays, sounds, straits, and estuaries. However, there was some objection to that definition by the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice contended that it would be far more preferable not to attempt to define inland waters, but simply to use the words "inland waters," to meet the standard that those words would ordinarily suggest. Therefore, at the suggestion of the Department of Justice, and I suppose with the support of the Department of State, the words "including all bays, estuaries, straits, and sounds," were stricken from the joint resolution.

I submit that the language of the joint resolution is the best agreement that could be reached, upon the advice of the competent officials of the State Department and the Justice Department, as well as the advice that the committee had available to it from all the witnesses who testified, and therefore we should retain the committee language rather than accept the definition of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that there are some islands off the main continent which are not as far as 3 miles distant, and that this amendment would confuse the situation with reference to them? I refer to Long Island, off the coast of New York, and Padre Island off the coast of Texas. The reason? Texas has

what might be considered a very even coast line in that there is a long island, Padre Island, which is only a short distance away from the main continent. Of course we measure low tide on the outer line of Padre Island, not from the main continent. Under this amendment would not Padre Island along the Texas coast, as well as Long Island, along the coast of New York, be thrown into the open sea? We would have to apply this amendment instead of the present rule of inland waters which permits both the Nation and the State to measure from the outer line along those islands.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is completely correct. Moreover, this amendment would make Chesapeake Bay high seas, which makes no sense at all, because in Chesapeake Bay there is one point where a line drawn 3 miles from one island will not intersect with a line drawn 3 miles from the next island, which is more than 6 miles away. So Chesapeake Bay would be treated as high seas. Since the beginning of the Nation it has always been regarded as inland waters.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask the able Senator from Louisiana whether or not in his opinion, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois were adopted, thereafter the hostile fleet of an enemy country would be permitted clear sailing inside Long Island off the State of New York in such fashion that the Government of the United States could not be heard to object to such sailing?

Mr. LONG. I believe the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be to fix his own definition of inland waters, and by fixing his own definition of inland waters I strongly suspect that he would find not only that it would make Chesapeake Bay high seas, but that it would make Long Island Sound high seas, which, I am sure, the Senator did not have in mind at the time he offered the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I understand what the distinguished Senator from Illinois is seeking to accomplish by his amendment; and I recede in no respect from the statements I have made to him and on the floor of the Senate with reference to my feeling and my understanding that when an island is remote from the coast, with deep waters lying between, it has a coastline of its own, and a submerged belt of 3 geographic miles around it on all sides.

However, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that the amendment he proposes would get completely away from any continuous line for the definition of "coast line." The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would insert, on page 11, line 14, after the word "coast" the words "of the main continent." I ask him to follow this closely, because I think he will see that, as offered, his amendment is subject to a fatal objection.

The statement in subsection (c) of section 2 of the joint resolution, with which we are now concerned, would make for a

coastline one single line completely consecutive and coextensive, all the way around the sea borders of a State, by joining together two different lines, one of which is the ordinary low-water mark along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea, and the other of which is the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters.

The Senator from Florida pointed out in an earlier statement on the floor that segments of those two lines joined together from time to time make one contiguous, coextensive line which extends all the way along the coastline of the State, whereas the words which the Senator from Illinois proposes to insert, the words "of the main continent," would leave many gaps between the first line which he outlines, that is, the line of ordinary low-water mark along that portion on the coast of the main continent which is in direct contact with the open sea, and the other line, which is the segment which marks the seaward limits of inland waters. In the case of islands along the coast, whether close or far away, there would frequently be a complete lack of joinder of the segments referred to under the 2 different definitions in subsection (c), so as to make 1 consecutive line.

I think I understand what the Senator is trying to attain. What he is trying to attain is in complete accord with the belief of the Senator from Florida, that islands which are far remote from the coast, and clear beyond inland waters by any reasonable conception, have a 3-mile submerged shelf around each of them; and while that fact is clearly shown in the statement of international law furnished to the committee in the last Congress by the Secretary of State at that time, Mr. Dean Acheson, the proposed amendment would not effectuate that situation at all, but would, instead, leave us with a definition of "coastline" in the joint resolution, the various segments of which would not join. There would be many gaps, many places in which there would be no joinder. There would be many cases of indeterminate jurisdiction, such as the Chandealeur Sound area, which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has just mentioned in the case of Louisiana.

The RECORD will show that the Senator from Florida, in testifying before the committee—and I believe I made the same statement in the argument on the floor of the Senate—stated that in his judgment it was quite clear that the coastline of Louisiana was along the outer line of the great bow of islands which comprise the Chandealeur Islands, and which are offshore of the shallow patch of water known as Chandealeur Sound.

The point I am making now is that under the definition in the joint resolution, as stated, there would be no question about the outer rim of the Chandealeur Islands being that portion of the coast which is in contact with the open sea—which would be the open Gulf of Mexico in that case—and that that line, when joined to other segments which mark the seaward limits of inland waters, and other portions of the coast in contact with the open gulf would

make a contiguous coextensive line extending all the way along the gulf frontage of Louisiana. There would be a failure to accomplish that result under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in dealing with the logic, or attempted logic, of the opponents of this amendment, I should merely like to point out that in this amendment we seek to define "coastline" as "the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast of the main continent which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters." And in the case of islands to the seaward, "coastline" would mean "the line of ordinary low-water mark around such island."

The land on the shores of a bay is not "in direct contact with the open sea." The land along the Connecticut coast fronts Long Island Sound, but not the Atlantic Ocean. The shore line of bays and estuaries, even though washed by tidal waters, does not front the open sea and is landward of the outer "limit of inland waters," and hence would not become the "coastline" under this definition. Such waters in bays and harbors would still continue to be inland waters under State control, and with State ownership of the submerged lands.

To the objections of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], let me only point out that if read in context with the balance of Section 2 (c), the amendment offers a "coastline" fully as continuous as the line in the original joint resolution.

I would say to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that this amendment makes no change in the meaning or the rule of "inland waters." The amendment leaves wholly unchanged the words of the joint resolution "the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters" and the prior words "in direct contact with the open sea."

The status of Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, the waters between Padre Island and the main shore of Texas, and his own cherished Chandealeur Sound as inland waters would be in no way affected or changed by the pending amendment. All other bays and harbors would be similarly undisturbed.

If the language of the joint resolution is clear on this point, the language of the amendment which leaves the foregoing phrases unchanged is just as clear. The final clause of the amendment, relating to islands, clearly refers to islands outside, or seaward, of such inland waters. The hostile fleets of enemies would get no more license to prey upon our ships or shores in Long Island Sound under this amendment than under the joint resolution.

Far from changing the accepted definition of "inland waters," Mr. President, what this amendment seeks to do is to prevent such a change and expansion in the traditional concept of inland waters, by preventing coastal States from pushing their coastal boundaries out to a line along the outer shores of remote islands and claiming everything in between.

This amendment is one more attempt to limit the amount of the giveaway, to restrict the submerged lands and resources turned over to coastal States by clearing up and making definite the baseline from which their claims of ownership may, under the pending resolution, commence.

I merely wish to point out that unless we clear up some of the ambiguities in the joint resolution, we shall find that the "coast" line will be a floating affair, and there will be a tendency on the part of the States to try to push the shoreline farther and farther out into the ocean. One of the convenient ways of doing so will be to claim that the coastline does not begin until the outer rim of the farthestmost islands lying off the coast is reached. This amendment would close the door on such claims. Billions of dollars probably are involved in this definition.

Mr. President, I suppose the Senate is in a mood now to give away everything, and probably there is not much use in pushing the amendment. Nevertheless I press the amendment, I urge its adoption, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Beall	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bennett	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Hoey	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Case	Jackson	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Mansfield	Welker
Frear	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Goldwater	McClellan	
Gore	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSL].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] would vote "yea"; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea"; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—26

Aiken	Hill	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Case	Jackson	Neely
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Tobey
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Green	Monroney	Young
Hayden	Morse	

NAYS—50

Barrett	Bricker	Butler, Md.
Beall	Bridges	Carlson
Bennett	Bush	Clements

Cordon	Hunt	Potter
Daniel	Ives	Purtell
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Saltanstill
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Schoepfel
Ellender	Knowland	Smathers
Ferguson	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Long	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Malone	Stennis
George	Martin	Taft
Goldwater	McCarran	Thye
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Watkins
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Welker
Hoey	Millikin	Williams
Holland	Payne	

NOT VOTING—20

Butler, Nebr.	Griswold	Magnuson
Byrd	Hennings	Maybank
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Kerr	Symington
Gillette	Kilgore	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report 29 nominations of general rank in the Marine Corps and flag rank in the Navy and ask that they be printed in the Executive Calendar. I also report reference No. 232 containing the 7 names of Reserve general officers in the Army for indefinite-term appointments as required by section 224 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and I ask unanimous consent that this reference number be placed on the Executive Calendar, immediately following Calendar No. 109, message No. 186.

I also report from the committee 1,542 routine nominations in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below in the Army, and in the grade of lieutenant and below in the Air Force and Navy. As in executive session, I request that in order to save the expense of printing this large list of names in the Executive Calendar, and inasmuch as they have already appeared once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for inspection by any Senator, prior to their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Francis O'Ryan and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Arthur Howard Ackerman and sundry other cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Rear Adm. John W. Roper, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral;

Bernard E. Manseau and sundry other officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral;

Vernon E. Megee for permanent appointment to the grade of major general of the Marine Corps; and

Albert D. Cooley for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general of the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the treaties appearing on the first page of the Executive Calendar, and the nominations which have been passed over and which appear on the second page of the Executive Calendar, be passed over at this time. After the vote, on next Tuesday, on the pending joint resolution, I intend to call again the Executive Calendar in order that the treaties may be considered. I hope Senators will examine them. After the treaties are disposed of, I intend to ask for the consideration of the other nominations which have been on the Executive Calendar for some time. I ask that the Executive Calendar now be called, beginning with No. 202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations will be stated.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jack K. McFall, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of all nominations made this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, unless Senators wish to speak further this evening, I expect to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. It is not the intention to have any votes tomorrow. I understand the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will present his amendment, and, of course, there will be the replies with respect to that amendment, after which I shall ask that the vote be put over until next Monday. There will be no session of the Senate on Saturday. I hope that on Monday we can dispose of the remaining amendments. If Senators desire to proceed into Monday evening, Mr. President, that can be done.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Ohio tell us when he expects to call the Legislative Calendar?

Mr. TAFT. We expect to call the Legislative Calendar on Wednesday of next week.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE AND FORMER SENATOR GARRETT L. WITHERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is with extreme sorrow that I announce to the Senate the death of a former Member of this body, GARRETT L. WITHERS, who passed away this afternoon at the Naval Hospital. At the time of his death he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was read by the Chief Clerk, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS, late a Representative and former Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Kentucky to attend the funeral of the late Representative and former Senator from that State.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to discuss with the majority leader the question of whether a day can be agreed upon next week on which Senators may have an opportunity to offer any expressions they may desire to offer in eulogy of the late Senator WITHERS.

Mr. TAFT. I would suggest Thursday of next week, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is very satisfactory. Do I correctly understand that some portion of next Thursday will be set aside for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. At the beginning of the session on Thursday.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad an opportunity will be afforded Members of the Senate to speak in eulogy of former Senator WITHERS. I should like to say that I join with my colleague in his expression of sorrow and regret at the news of the passing of this distinguished son of Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative and former Senator WITHERS, of Kentucky, I move that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 1, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

IN THE ARMY

FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDING GENERAL, FOURTH ARMY, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 504 AND 515 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Maj. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist, O7120, United States Army.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SUBSECTION 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harry Reichelderfer, O7547.
Brig. Gen. Frank Albert Allen, Jr., O7415.
Brig. Gen. David Ayres Depue Ogden, O12051.

Brig. Gen. Arthur William Pence, O12042.
Brig. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652.
Brig. Gen. Eugene Ware Ridings, O15230.
Brig. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782.

Brig. Gen. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles George Holle, O12612.
Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden, O14699.

Col. Frank McAdams Albrecht, O15131.
Col. Edward Gilbert Farrand, O16788.
Col. Normando Antonio Costello, O17764.
Col. Roy Ernest Lindquist, O18125.
Col. Archibald William Stuart, O18130.
Col. Tom Victor Stayton, O18417.
Col. Edwin John Messinger, O18503.
Col. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552.
Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS TO THE POSITIONS INDICATED, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL AND AS LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 504 AND 515 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be lieutenant general, Regular Air Force to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force

Maj. Gen. Samuel Egbert Anderson, 92A.

To be lieutenant general, Regular Air Force to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A.

To be lieutenant general, Regular Air Force to be Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia.

Jack K. McFall, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

HAWAII

Farrant Lewis Turner, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. S. C. Eastvold, president, Pacific Lutheran College, Tacoma, Wash., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Everlasting Father, and Prince of Peace, we pause to acknowledge Thee as our maker, redeemer, and comforter.

We thank Thee for this new day, for its challenges and opportunities.

We pray Thy blessing upon the President of our United States of America, and upon the Congress now assembled—upon the 48 Commonwealths which comprise our Nation, and upon all those placed in positions of authority and trust in our country.

Wilt Thou bless and protect the citizens of our Nation. May those who art in this great legislative assembly be given wise and understanding hearts and minds so that the decisions they make may be good for us today, for our posterity still unborn, and for the nations of the world now joining with us in sighing, crying, and praying for peace. Wilt Thou, O God of our fathers and our God, look with forgiving mercy upon us, even when our best motives and energies are lacking in perfection.

Watch over our poor, erring world and let the sum total of the acts of Congress meet with Thy smiling approval and blessing for today and in the light of eternal truth.

This prayer we offer in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 28, 1953, was read and approved.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments on State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY reserved all points of order on the bill.

WHO IS ADVOCATING FREE INTERNATIONAL TRADE?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, who are some of the advocates of free international trade under such slogans as "More trade, less aid"?

I received in the mail the other day a 4-page pamphlet espousing free trade and signed by 23 individuals.

I sent those names to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Of these 23 individuals, the committee told me 10 are or were affiliated with organizations cited as Communist or subversive by the committee or the Attorney General of the United States.

Who knows better than Communists that an effective way to destroy our economy and form of government is to flood the United States with the products of cheap foreign labor and thereby throw our agriculture, industry and labor into a depression?

The name of the organization which printed and distributed the pamphlet is the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

The 10 individuals who signed the pamphlet and who are listed by the House Un-American Activities Committee as affiliated, past or present, with Communist or subversive organizations, are as follows:

George Boas, professor of philosophy, Johns Hopkins University; Gertrude C. Bussey, professor of philosophy, Goucher College; R. A. Gordon, professor of economics, University of California; Herman Herrey, described as a New York architect and social planner; William Ernest Hocking, professor of philosophy emeritus, Harvard University; Ernest Minor Patterson, president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., New York lawyer; Karl W. H. Scholz, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania; Charles J. Turck,

president of MacAlester College; and Clair Wilcox, professor of economics, Swarthmore College.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL NONQUOTA IMMIGRATION VISAS TO CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special nonquota-immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes.

It has been evident for several years past that the indiscriminate removal of peoples from their homeland into the rump of Western Europe has had disastrous effect upon the morale of the people, brought about unbearable health and housing conditions, all of which are hardly conducive of stable economy. This influx of an estimated 10 million peoples, commonly referred to as displaced persons and expellees, has resulted in an ever-increasing burden not only upon that country but upon the occupying authorities. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this expulsion has been carried out in utter disregard of the Potsdam proclamation, that the same should be effected and accomplished in an orderly and humane manner. President Eisenhower, as well as the majority of the American people, is aware of the inequities and injustices thus imposed. The situation, though transitory and temporary, is nevertheless acute, and in accordance with the suggestion of our President this legislation should receive immediate favorable consideration and action.

Mr. Speaker, I have also this day introduced a bill which seeks to remedy an unjust situation which in effect circumvented the intentions of American citizens who as donors had made a gift, devise, legacy, or inheritance to citizens or nationals of Austria and Germany.

Under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, prior to the issuance of Presidential Proclamation No. 2950, issued October 24, 1951, any gift, devise, legacy, or inheritance made to a citizen or national of either of said countries aforementioned, was vested in and delivered to the United States—Office of Alien Property Custodian and/or Department of Justice, Office of Alien Property. This bill will permit the return under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, of property which such alien acquired by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance from an American citizen.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 224, Rept.

No. 334) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4882) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tomorrow to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY—A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT A BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with the Senators from New York, Mr. Ives and Mr. Lehman, in introducing bills today in both Houses to appoint a United States Commission for the Bicentennial of Columbia University in the city of New York for the purpose of participating in the celebration of Columbia University's 200th anniversary in 1954. Columbia University is located within my congressional district. The commission is to be composed of 15 members, as follows: The President of the United States and four persons appointed by him; the President of the Senate and four Senators appointed by him; and the Speaker of the House and four Representatives appointed by him. It follows similar commissions appointed in connection with the 200th anniversary of Princeton University in 1946, and Washington and Lee University in 1948.

Seventeen colleagues in this House are fellow-alumni of Columbia. They are Representatives THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Massachusetts; CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., New York; HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., New York; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; HAL HOLMES, Washington; RALPH W. GWINN, New York; RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York; CLIFFORD P. CASE,

New Jersey; JAMES J. DELANEY, New York; EMANUEL CELLER, New York; JAMES G. DONOVAN, New York; and SIDNEY FINE, Columbia alumni in the other body include Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah; WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey; LISTER HILL, Alabama; WAYNE MORSE, Oregon; and KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota.

The theme of the bicentennial has already been announced by Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, as "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." 95 educational and cultural institutions in 33 countries have announced that they are joining 250 similar institutions in the United States in advancing this theme through exhibits, lectures, scholarly works and publications and in participating in the bicentennial.

It is the aim of Columbia University in celebrating its bicentennial in effect to establish a United Nations of education and enlist them in attaining the purposes of education—knowledge, and the purpose of freedom—the free use of knowledge. The international implications of this celebration are a splendid contribution to our time. The universality of knowledge is an appropriate basis for greater world unity and its dedication to the purposes of freedom should be an inspiration to peoples not now enjoying freedom. It is significant that countries in the Communist orbit were invited to participate in the bicentennial as early as May 1950, when President Eisenhower was president of Columbia University. Recently new invitations have been sent. Institutions of higher learning and educational and cultural institutions generally can be the greatest force for marshalling the spirit and energy of the free world. The free world needs its own crusade to pursue with zeal its objectives of the development and improvement of the individual and of the opportunities for the individual. To these objectives, education is the key. It is to be hoped that the occasion of the bicentennial and the joining together of so many foreign and domestic educational and cultural institutions in its celebration will result as a permanent memorial of this event in some organizational cooperation between these institutions and in making their united efforts felt as a force for liberty and progress.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a paper which states:

Democratic speakers yesterday opened a concerted attack on the "drift and indecision" of the Eisenhower administration.

I rise to point out to my colleagues on my right that in the first 101 days of

the Eisenhower administration the House passed three reorganization acts, something the Truman administration could not do in several years.

We passed the tidelands bill and the Hawaiian statehood bill. The President initiated a loyalty program that is going to insure the American people that we will have no more Communies and Communist sympathizers in important places in Government. The House has cut the first two appropriation bills, and it looks like we would end the deficits. The Truman and the Roosevelt administration never balanced the budget in the 20 years they were in power. They did not know how to balance the budget. That is going to be done this year. They expect us to clean up in 101 days the mess that it took them 20 years to toss together.

The New Deal administration debauched the dollar until it was worth only 50 cents. They built up a \$257 billion debt. Their budget for this year called for \$9 billion of spending over income. They caused an inflation and a waste of the people's savings, with the heaviest tax burden the country has ever known.

The speakers at the New Deal Democratic rally in New York last night did not tell the people that there was almost a scandal a day under their administration. They did tell the people the Korean affair was just a police action. My, how many policemen and casualties we had for what the President called just a police action. Was not he the same President who said the marines were a propaganda machine and that he liked old Joe? Was it not the New Deal who threatened to seize the cattle on the ranges and said they had a right to take over private property? It was the New Deal who reached for more and more power for the Central Government. The same group of men who spoke in New York would give the individual no rights which the Government need observe. It was the same group speaking last night who wanted politics by political cronies. Under that system of government, communism and corruption flourished. They were the ones who could not and dared not have a peace. Their prosperity was based upon spending for wars and emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration has brought a new air of confidence to the American people. There is no longer that stench of corruption in the nostrils which thrived under Pendergastism and all the phases of New Dealism. The people rejoice that we have a man as President of the United States who has taken the lead in a program which has seen the return of wounded soldiers from Korea. They rejoice that they have a leadership which is on the road to ending the wars and one which will assure a peace with prosperity. It is an administration that will not tolerate corruption and communism and disloyalty. Yes, Mr. Speaker; people who work for Government come to work 30 minutes earlier than heretofore. They are giving an honest day's work for the dollars they earn. The President has even given up that luxury ship, the *Williamsburg*, which was a symbol of luxury, and

I understand some other social games. No, Mr. Speaker; the New Dealers who ranted and raved in New York last night cannot laugh off the accomplishments of the first 100 days of the Eisenhower administration. The 35 million people who voted for a change are thankful that the President and his Cabinet are approaching the problems of government with an understanding heart and mind.

RUSSIAN PEACE GESTURES

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the recent peace gestures advanced by the Russian Government and the exchange of wounded prisoners in Korea, with the possible resumption of truce negotiations with the Chinese Communists, raised the hopes of many Americans that Russia and her satellite nations had some genuine desire for working out a peaceful solution of the present conflict. Recent developments, however, have raised some question as to the sincerity of the Russians and the Iron Curtain satellite nations.

If Russia and her satellites desire to demonstrate a real purpose toward peace there are many steps they can take which will restore some confidence in their protestations of desire to cooperate with the rest of the world. I briefly mention the matter of civilians from the free countries who are held prisoner behind the Iron Curtain under various pretexts.

The most recent instance of seizing free-nation nationals and imprisoning them is the case of Mr. Richard Applegate, press and radio correspondent, whose family are residents of my district. Along with Mr. Applegate, Mr. Donald Dixon of the International News Service and Marine Capt. Benjamin Krasner were seized by the Chinese Communists and have been held prisoner for the past several weeks.

I further recall the case of Mr. William Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, who has been held by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia for nearly 3 years on trumped-up charges.

More than 100 American civilians have been seized and are being held by Russia and other Iron Curtain countries.

It appears logical to me that the Russian Government and its satellites have an opportunity to show any sincere interest in promoting better relations by immediately restoring these American citizens to freedom. The State Department should continue to urge this matter upon the Iron Curtain countries. Let them now prove their sincerity.

ESSAY ON THE NEED FOR A STRONG AMERICAN DEMOCRACY BY JUDY BEACHAM OF EUCLID, OHIO

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, thanks to your generosity in making the Speaker's dining room available to the Ohio Delegation Members on both sides of the aisle, we of Ohio had a particularly pleasant luncheon hour on Wednesday.

Each year the Ohio American Legion and the Legion Auxiliary bring to Washington the 12 boys and girls who have won top honors for essays of not more than 600 words on some patriotic subject, and we Ohio Congressmen entertained them at luncheon in the Speaker's dining room. This year the subject was *The Need of a Strong American Democracy*. I was very proud to have as my guest the winner from my own congressional district, pretty Judy Beacham, of Euclid, Ohio. Judy combines daintiness and good looks with intelligence, capacity, and the determination to fit herself to be one of Ohio's best teachers. I was indeed happy to present her to my colleagues.

Again thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, our young people had the honor of your personal words to them and the added thrill of having you present to them the lovely Dinah Shore. I wish all of you could have felt the excitement of these high-schoolers when Miss Shore spoke to them, and when the Speaker then introduced her very good-looking husband, George Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to ask unanimous consent to insert my prize-winner's essay herewith:

THE NEED FOR A STRONG AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
(By Judy Beacham, of Euclid, Ohio)

Before me there is a small globe. As I turn it around I catch brief glimpses of South America, Africa, India, Russia, and Western Europe. People live in these countries. People with black, brown, yellow, and white skins. People who wear different clothes, eat different foods, and follow different customs than I do. Yet these people are the same as I am. We were all created equal by God. Everyone should have the same rights. But do they? No.

Here in the United States we have a representative democracy. Democracy is government by the consent of the people. Every person is valuable in his own right. By letting a man work and helping him to do his best, we are helping him to be an asset to his home and community. Our democracy guarantees the five freedoms of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. People can go to the church of their choice. They can speak their minds. Our newspapers, radio broadcasts, telephone conversations, and mail are not censored. Everyone is entitled to a fair court trial. Children can go to public, private, or parochial schools. Democracy places on each person the obligation to serve the state in some way. We must have a strong American democracy so we can keep on enjoying these privileges.

Democracy is far from perfect. It started in the history of western civilization but has made its big start here in the United States.

We are now being threatened, not just our lives and country, but our ideals. Democracy has many enemies who fight democracy because they are afraid of it. These enemies attack some part of democracy such as labor, aliens, races, and religions. Groups of these people form organizations that sound perfectly harmless but are really fronts for Fascists, Nazis, and Communists.

We must fight to keep the great democracy that is ours, not necessarily with physical force, but with our minds. We must get to the people behind the Iron Curtain. We must make them understand democracy is good. Until we help all the oppressed countries, not everyone will have the many wonderful rights we cherish today. Not only are we trying to help other countries, but we are trying to improve our own democracy. We must keep our own Nation on a high level to influence the other countries. It is the job of every person in the United States to make a strong American democracy.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday being Polish Constitution Day, and since the House will not be in session, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1953, will mark the 162d anniversary of the adoption of a constitution by the freedom-loving people of Poland. Let us, here in this Congress, take a few moments from the business of the day to think and speak of Poland; yes, and to pray deeply in our hearts for her freedom.

Hers has been a troubled life indeed. Kings have come and gone, as have republics and parliaments. Today her people exist under the iron heel of Communist Russia, the same Russia that sent her armies into Poland, gave the word for the revolt against the Nazis and then sat immovable across the river while the people of Warsaw were subdued by hunger as much as by Hitler's men.

I remember so well our 3 or 4 days in Warsaw in the summer of 1945. Karl Mundt—now Senator Mundt—Tom Gordon, Joe Ryder, and I were given an assignment by the Foreign Affairs Committee to go to Eastern Europe and the Near East and bring back all the first-hand information we could gather in. Our report was made a committee document and printed. It is for all to read for even today it makes interesting reading.

One picture of Warsaw is etched inerasably on my memory. We had been picking our way over piles of brick and rubble, looking with shocked eyes at the unbelievable destruction. Suddenly I felt impelled to look up—expecting to see nothing but more wrecked walls, crazy-looking staircases and caved-in roofs. But lo, and behold, there on a third floor balcony sat a woman behind her petunia-filled flower boxes. As our eyes met, her face lighted up with one of the most wonderful smiles I have ever seen. I felt she was saying to me, "Yes, look well at the stark tragedy of this great city; never forget the rubble, never forget the stench of death arising from the bodies of men and women still buried under the debris. But even as you remember these things—and they will stay with you all the days of your life—know that nothing can dim the love of freedom in the heart of a Pole. Know this well for that is my woman's heart, even as you see me smile."

Mr. Speaker, such indeed are the people of Poland—such will they ever be.

We, here in these United States, are ever grateful to Kosciusko, to Sobieski, to Pulaski. We are proud that so many Poles have come to us, adding their fiery courage, their indomitable spirits to our own, that freedom may ring over their children's children. They make good, strong Americans.

It is fitting indeed, Mr. Speaker, that we pause a moment in this Chamber to lift our hearts in hope and faith to Him who is the source of courage and the Light of the World, asking that Poland may once again cast off the galling and increasingly intolerable chains of servitude and be free.

OLD-AGE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a discharge petition No. 2 to bring on the floor for passage H. R. 2446, which I introduced on February 2, 1953. It will be considered under an open rule. This is the old-age pay-as-you-go social security program. Our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] introduced a companion bill, H. R. 2447. I discussed this legislation at some length on the floor on February 6, 1953, which discussion appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date at page 944. Also, I made a brief analysis of the bill, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1490.

I most sincerely and humbly request all persons who are interested in old-age security to sign this petition. All persons who are interested in revising the plan that we now have for social security, which is a hodgepodge and misnomer and which is costing millions of dollars a year should sign this petition so that we can have an overall program, pay-as-you-go program, similar to the one covered by this legislation. It will save us money in the long run and treat our old people fairly who are the forgotten people in our Nation. There are millions of aged citizens now in dire need and who are not covered under any social security or retirement program.

H. R. 2446 and its companion bill, H. R. 2447, provide a solution for this momentous problem of old-age security in a pay-as-you-go basis with Federal old-age security for all, as stated in the title to the bill. This legislation embodies the program of the Townsend organization which down through the years has waged a relentless battle for the enactment of legislation for Nation-wide old-age Federal security on a pay-as-you-go basis. The thanks of the oldsters of America are due to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder of this broad humanitarian movement, who by his great courage, industry, and indomitable willpower and effective organizational abilities has carried on this relentless fight for old-age

security. The advances we have made in the last decade in this large field of human rights are due to a large extent to Dr. Townsend and his loyal supporters and to the legion of co-workers in the fight for full and equal rights to America's aged citizens.

On December 31, 1952, the Federal Security Agency records show that there was held by it total assets of \$17,441,718,877.92, \$16,960,377,304.69 of which, "invested" in the so-called Government IOU's, has already been spent for carrying on the regular activities of the Government. These funds are no longer available as assets for meeting the obligations of the social security program and paying the annuities for which the fund was created. In order to meet these payments when needed it will be necessary to levy an additional tax on all the taxpayers of the Nation whenever current receipts are insufficient to meet these payments.

Mr. Speaker, old-age security should be provided on a pay-as-you-go basis with neither the stigma of charity nor of poverty. It should be given as a matter of right as dividends from the national wealth the aged have helped to create. Such a program which would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law would have a stimulative effect upon our economy and would help to make available jobs to all the young who will replace the aged as the latter move into retirement at a decent standard of living. Only noncontributory annuities on a pay-as-you-go basis will meet the needs of those now grown old who are in need because of past neglect in providing an adequate contributory retirement system.

I urge all Members of the House to sign now the Discharge Petition No. 2.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House was not in session yesterday, I was not able to take advantage of the special order granted me. I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FIRST 101 DAYS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], who is so proud of these first 101 days, that thousands of farmers throughout the Mid-

west and the West are selling their cows because they cannot stand the humiliation of seeing those 15-cent Republican calves running around the same field with these 30-cent Democratic cows.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE HOOVER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] to the great achievement of the Hoover administration. President Hoover balanced the budget. Unfortunately for the country, the great achievement failed to stem the great depression. Conditions today are alarmingly similar to those during President Hoover's first 100 days. Does the gentleman consider the risk of giving another trial run to the Hoover approach to economic problems?

LOYALTY DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 1, is a day which will be observed by people in Communist countries as a day for celebration of the progress of communism, the teachings and philosophy of communism, and the future plans and program of the Communists to conquer and dominate the world.

Strange though it may seem, there will be here in America some deluded people who will join with Communist Reds and pro-Communist pinks in celebrating May Day as a day to be set aside for the promotion of communistic doctrines.

For years the Communists and their sympathizers have carried on their May Day demonstrations in various ways. Here in America they have harangued from soap boxes, they have held parades, they have belittled the American Government, smeared our Constitution, and insulted the flag of our country, while fanatically promoting the doctrines of communism and the principles of that cruel, atheistic, degraded, barbaric philosophy.

However, there are many patriotic citizens in America who will observe tomorrow and celebrate it as Loyalty Day, and it is well that we take the time to emphasize loyalty on this day.

Here in America we have taken liberty for granted. Freedom has been a part of our life, and we have never feared that it could be attacked with success either from within or from without. Prior to this generation it has never occurred to us that the solid foundations of American freedom could be threatened by any such strange ideology as totalitarian communism, nor have we

felt the least apprehension that our fighting forces would find it troublesome to quickly defeat on the field of battle the strongest array of military strength which all the forces of communism throughout the world might muster and throw against us.

Yet, within the past few years we have seen irrefutable proof that communism has gained tens of thousands of disciples here in America. We have seen the flower of American manhood carry on for nearly 3 years a fight against Communist forces in Korea, which has cost us 34,303 in dead and missing, and total casualties of 133,787, yet the battlefield remains almost at the same place it was located when this war started on June 25, 1950.

So the fact is being forced upon us that freedom and liberty are blessings which can be lost through apathy and indifference, and that victory on the battlefield for the cause which is just does not follow as a matter of course. It is achieved by those who are prepared, who plan their strategy best, who have adequate equipment and supplies, and who have the courage and will to fight to victory.

Mr. Speaker, I make these remarks to emphasize the fact that affirmative action is needed to counteract the demonstrations which are made by the loud and vocal subversive minorities on such occasions as their May Day demonstrations. I make them also to call attention to the fact that tomorrow will be observed as Loyalty Day in many places and in various ways.

In my home State of Georgia, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have created a State committee for the celebration of May 1 as Loyalty Day, which committee is headed by Mr. Charles A. Moran, of Atlanta, Ga., as chairman of the department of Georgia committee to celebrate Loyalty Day 1953. That committee advises me that Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, who is a member of Post 3027, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has issued a Loyalty Day proclamation, requesting all good citizens to participate in the observation of Loyalty Day by rededicating themselves to the American way of life. He points out that as the world is passing through one of the crucial periods of history, the uncertainty of the immediate future is such that every loyal American citizen should take an open, positive stand for freedom and democracy.

The VFW commander of the department of Georgia, Mr. Asa D. Kelly, Jr., of Albany, issued a statement in which he says:

Loyalty Day will be a mass reaffirmation of loyalty to God, our country, our flag, and to our beloved State of Georgia—a rededication of our people to those principles upon which our country was founded.

I join with these veterans of our wars, and with patriotic Americans from every walk of life, and in every section of our country in reaffirming these principles of loyalty, and in rededicating ourselves on this Loyalty Day to the preservation of our country, our Government, and the freedom, liberty, and opportunity which that Government guarantees to all within its jurisdiction.

RELEASING PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, according to an Associated Press report, Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison, chief Allied negotiator in Korea, today warned the Communists that the Allies might release 32,000 North Korean POW's whom we now hold and who have stated they will violently resist repatriation.

This is an excellent start in the right direction but we should go further and actually release those anti-Communist POW's immediately.

This would resolve the entire POW issue and could cause no protest by the Communists since, as Lieutenant General Harrison points out, we would be following a pattern already created by the Reds in releasing thousands of POW's whom they captured.

Such an action, furthermore, would be in conformity with our promise to those POW's when we bombed Communist troops with surrender leaflets. In these leaflets we promised freedom to the soldiers who surrendered to us. Here are some excerpts from the U. N. surrender leaflets which we dropped on the Communist troops:

Most of you were not Communists. You were forced by a few Communist leaders to fight and be sacrificed for Russia. Why should you continue to do this? Join the United Nations side for freedom and prosperity.

Bring your fellow soldiers over to the U. N. forces: Good food, good treatment, and eventual freedom await you.

Choose the road that leads to safety and life. Escape your unit now and come to U. N. lines.

The day of liberation will surely come.

The day of liberation will come. A little more patience in adversity. Trust us. You will enjoy your former freedom.

According to Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, former Chief of Psychological Warfare, United States Army, more than 30 percent of the POW's we hold were thus influenced by our leaflets to surrender.

We have already been too long negligent in fulfilling our promise—most of these POW's have been languishing in United States stockades for more than 2 years.

We should also release the Chinese POW's who refuse to return to their homelands and permit them to go to Formosa if they so desire.

The release of these POW's would also lend material substance and reliability to the recent offer of Gen. Mark Clark of \$50,000 and freedom for any enemy pilot who surrenders to us with his jet aircraft. Unless we release the POW's whom we now hold and to whom we already promised freedom, it might be wrongly concluded that we will not fulfill our new promise. Or even if we do that we are more interested in a piece of machinery than in a human being. We can show that we are equally interested

in having an enemy infantryman join our side by giving immediate freedom to the anti-Communist POW's.

The proposal of the Communists that the nonrepatriate POW's be turned over to a neutral nation cannot be acceptable to us since we could then not be sure that these people will not be repatriated against their will. We can remove this entire subject from further bargaining by their immediate release.

The U. N. has stumbled onto, in the POW issue, the Achilles heel of the Communist empire. We have discovered that in the heat of battle the Communists cannot rely on their unwilling slaves to fight for them. Thus in any future battle, the Communists will constantly fear the loss of their troops to the enemy by voluntary surrender. Recent reports from Korea state that the Communists must dispatch a guard to watch over their patrols lest those soldiers defect to the enemy. Release of the anti-Communist POW's now will strike a crippling blow to the Communist expansion in Asia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HULL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was granted leave of absence for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of House Ways and Means Committee hearings on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, the public is being subjected to a barrage of propaganda that attacks the philosophy of providing protection for American industries and labor groups against cheap foreign goods. One of the outstanding examples appeared recently in the Wall Street Journal. It was an article with a Caracas, Venezuela, dateline that had all the characteristics of a press release from the offices of an international oil company.

At the outset the article mentioned that there are now more than 20 bills pending before the United States Congress to limit oil imports into this country. Quite appropriately, a quotation bemoaning the consequences of such legislation was taken from an executive of the Creole Petroleum Corp., the Venezuelan subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The writer of the article then proceeded to discuss what he termed "some proposals" to limit United States petroleum imports to 5 percent of domestic production. The fact of the matter is that the 5 percent proposals introduced into this Congress apply exclusively to residual oil, but apparently the writer was determined not to let facts in any way interfere with his campaign in behalf of the oilers.

After citing testimony from another official of the Creole Corp., the writer

stated that Venezuela would lose as much as from \$150 million to \$250 million annually if his phantom bill were to become law. A similar editorial in a Washington newspaper earlier this month, while correctly stating that the 5 percent limitation is to be applied to residual oil imports, estimated that the so-called loss to Venezuela would be perhaps \$300 million. Evidently the qualifying word "perhaps" was intended to account for any variance from actual figures, but I frankly do not understand why publishers permit such exaggerations even in these days of extreme inflation. Here are the facts:

The total value of residual oil imported from both Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles in 1952 was \$215 million. According to the Balance of Payments Yearbook of the International Monetary Fund, about one-half of the selling price of oil exports remains in Venezuela—which would leave that country with about \$107½ million from last year's sales of residual fuel oil.

If the proposed 5-percent quota limitation were to cut off residual fuel oil shipments by as much as 80 percent, as is anticipated, the highest revenue cut would be \$86 million. But this assumption would still be much too high, since it is based on the theory that there would be no other markets for the residual oil that is now shipped into the United States. The truth is that the United States has been taking 48 percent of the residual oil as against only 4 percent of all other refined products exported from Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles. Does the Wall Street Journal feel that the United States is obligated to continue to take this waste product—which is not needed here—off the hands of the refiners, who ship the better products to the four corners of the world? Probably so, because the article implies that the profitable disposition of Venezuelan oil—regardless of the harm it might bring to American industry and American workers—is of paramount importance. The article states that our proposals to limit imports have become a subject of discussion on the Plaza Bolivar in the heart of Caracas, at the country club, the Valle Arriba Club, the Hotel Avila, and in the "swank offices of skyscrapers rising from the rubble of demolished tenements."

I would like to say that the same topic is also being discussed right here in the United States, and not necessarily by habitues of country clubs and other lavish lounges and offices. It is being discussed by coal miners who are out of work because imported residual oil is being used in power stations and manufacturing plants that the coal industry has always served and would still be serving if it were not for the underselling of a foreign product by wealthy oil interests. It is being discussed by railroaders who are not working because their job of handling coal traffic has been taken away by ships flying ensigns that many of our own people do not recognize, inasmuch as when they think of a flag they think of the Stars and Stripes. It is being discussed by mothers who have seen their cupboards become bare while a few big oil men more than a thousand

miles away live in luxury at the expense of these very people.

Venezuela has only a negligible debt and boasts the highest per capita income in Latin America, the Wall Street Journal continues:

It's a land of balanced budgets, where few pay more than 4 percent income taxes and where a man with an 8½-million annual income need pay only 23 percent to the tax collector. A \$25,000-a-year man pays 4 percent; then there's a sliding scale up to 23 percent for \$8½ million.

Now, let me assure you that I am happy to know that everyone in Venezuela is getting along so well. It is certainly refreshing to hear of a country whose debt is negligible. But it so happens that the United States has a debt of almost \$300 billion. I would like to see that debt substantially reduced. I believe that we should encourage our industrial development wherever possible—even if some of the wealthier nations should object to the idea—for when our people are gainfully employed they are quite willing to contribute their share to the tax revenues.

The Venezuelan who makes \$25,000 a year pays only 4 percent in taxes. The American who makes only one-tenth that amount is required to pay 14 percent in taxes. Of course, he gets by for less if he has a wife and family, but you may be sure that he cannot afford to belong to a country club or to patronize any of the swank hotels if his income is \$2,500 a year. As for the United States citizen who has a taxable income of \$25,000 a year, his contribution to Uncle Sam comes to 42.4 percent. In other words, while the Venezuelan with a like income pays \$1,000 in taxes, the American must pay \$10,610.

Under the circumstances, do you not think that we can assume that the people in Venezuela are going to get along all right even if we reduce the amount of residual oil that is shipped into the United States from that country? Is it not time that we listen to the pleas of our working people rather than to those of the propagandists of the world oil corporations and the bleeding hearts of the State Department.

We are going to hear State Department officials testify along the very lines put into print by the Wall Street Journal and other international-minded publications. They will have statistics showing how other countries need our dollars and how we need their petroleum.

I can tell you that we do not need foreign residual oil in this country. Not a drop of it. We have coal to supply the energy requirements of our industries, and our domestic oil producers will gladly provide whatever amount of residual fuel oil is needed for ships' bunkers.

But will the State Department have figures showing how badly American coal miners and railroaders need dollars, and how many of them have been put out of work as a result of the State Department's ridiculous policies? That Department has sent teams of so-called specialists all over the globe to investigate economic, financial, political, moral, immoral, and psychological conditions, but I have never heard of its sending a

single representative into one of the mining or railroad communities in my congressional district to find out what effect the world-saving programs were having on my own people. I, personally, am sick and tired of these policies, and I say that it is time that the elected representatives of the people take the matter into their own hands.

EXEMPTION FROM THE ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951 OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 223, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 4654, which is a bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branches of the Government by amending the act by inserting on page 2, line 18, the following sentence:

Leaves of absence authorized under this subsection shall not constitute a leave system, and no such leave of absence which is not used shall be made the basis for any lump-sum payment.

The purpose of this legislation, to be more fully explained by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is to remove members of the President's Cabinet and certain other high officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government from the leave system which covers Federal employees generally, and it would leave these persons so removed in substantially the same position such persons would have held in 1932 when these top ranking officers of the Federal Government were grouped for the first time as employees in any act relating to leave.

This bill immediately exempts from the general leave system approximately 245 employees who were appointed by the President alone or by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and who are paid more than the highest rate paid in the Classification Act which, presently, is \$14,800. It would

also exempt approximately 71 chiefs of mission in foreign service who are appointed or assigned by the President and who are paid \$15,000 or more a year under the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The President under this bill is authorized to grant leaves of absence with pay to individuals who otherwise would have no such leave as a result of this legislation, but the authority to grant such leaves of absence does not constitute authority to establish a new leave system or to make lump-sum payments for unused leave authorized by the President. Chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service will still receive home leave as authorized under the act of 1951; this is not taken away from them.

The bill has some important provisions in it which provide for the acceleration of the time of payment for annual leave so that all of these payments for annual leave accrued up to the effective date of this act should not be interfered with in view of the fact that such action would seem to be *ex post facto*. But it is also felt that such accruals or accelerations should not be made payable at the present time. So the bill provides, as recommended by the Assistant Comptroller General, that officers and employees who have a vested right to annual leave will not be disturbed in that right, but that these lump-sum payments will be made at some future time to those who are entitled thereto upon the happening of one of these three events: First, separation of the officer or employee from the Federal service. When he quits he gets it. Second, death of the officer or employee; or, third, transfer of officer or employee after the time the bill becomes applicable to him to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the act of 1951.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It just occurs to me that the committee realizes it cannot make this action retroactive with respect to rights that have accrued. However, the committee attempts to defer payment. If it cannot make the act retroactive as to rights already accrued how can it make a provision with respect to those rights that have accrued and say it cannot be paid at the present time?

Mr. SCOTT. As I understand it, those rights are not rights which the individual may claim until he does leave the Federal service.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is that the way it is now?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. He cannot claim it now until his death or transfer to some other leave system. It preserves his right to receive the payment, but he does not earn any more lump-sum credits, nor do these 245 people, approximately, who will be appointed after the act, earn it at all. That is my understanding. It is the desire to cut the policy-making people out hereafter. We are going to save some money, which perhaps might have been saved some years ago.

The reason for that is in part due to the disclosure some weeks ago of the

fact that a number of very high ranking Federal employees left the Federal service and drew lump sums or bonuses ranging all over the field. Some of their leave pay was as high as seven, eight, or nine thousand dollars. They were Cabinet officers, some of them were extremely wealthy men, and not a one of them, as I recall, declined this bonus from the Federal Government. The total amount which has been quietly withdrawn under a system as to which the public was certainly unaware, exceeded \$780,000. To correct that sort of thing, this bill was introduced.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. It is obvious it is the intention of our Civil Service Committee, and no doubt the Rules Committee, to do away or help do away with existing conditions that the gentleman has just referred to that every reasonable person will admit was not proper. It seems to me this bill, H. R. 4654, instead of tightening up really loosens up our existing law.

Let me be specific about that. If you will turn to page 2, line 14, section (c) says:

The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence with pay to any officers—

And so forth. How much leave of absence is he going to authorize? Under existing law they either take their leave when it comes due after January 1, 1952, or else they do not get any pay for it. Now this act comes along and says that the President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence with pay. How much is he going to authorize?

Certainly, the number of people to whom he can authorize it is limited by this bill, some 200 or 250, as the gentleman has pointed out. But here we come along now and in a good-faith effort, I am sure, on the part of the legislative committee—attempt to do away with this abuse, but in truth and in fact, gentlemen, you have opened the door. Here is a certain party who may have come in during that year at a maximum, say, of 25 or 26 days, and for some good reason you cannot expect the Chief Executive to handle these matters personally; that is putting too big a burden on him, but you could very well say, "Here is a man who is a good man, he has worked hard," and he gets 60 days, 90 days, 4 months, 6 months, or how much? There is no limitation here. Gentlemen, that is what you have done, and in good faith.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The observation made by the gentleman from Texas is appreciated, because I know he is one of those who has given this matter a lot of consideration.

Mr. THOMAS. What I said is absolutely true. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is wide open now.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman knows that the court has held

that any one of these appointees can take off all of the time that he wants to and still draw his pay.

The court had before it the question of a person who was appointed as Recorder of Deeds.

Mr. THOMAS. We are talking about accumulation of annual leave now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, and he can take all the time he wants to.

Mr. THOMAS. As the law stands today he has either got to use his annual leave when it comes due or else he is going to get pay for it. Under your act here and under this language the President—and I am going to quote—"in his discretion, may authorize"—what?—"leaves of absence with pay." Well, now, what are you doing?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Read the remainder.

Mr. THOMAS. "To any officers and employees who are exempted in whole or in part from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Read on.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I understand it goes on and says that you are not setting up any leave system. We understand that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It says, "Leaves of absence authorized under this subsection shall not constitute a leave system."

Mr. THOMAS. Where is the limitation? How much are you going to give him? You say in one breath you are not setting up any system, but in the same breath you leave it wide open to do just exactly that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What we are saying is that the Presidential appointee is not restricted to the 13 days, but he may be allowed more time at the discretion of the President.

Mr. THOMAS. How much more are you going to give him?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is under the discretion of the President.

Mr. THOMAS. It could be 6 months or a year, then?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It could be. That is the law now.

Mr. SCOTT. As a matter of fact, what this colloquy illustrates is that the act is not being changed in that respect; that the right of the President to authorize leaves of absence to persons subject to Executive jurisdiction is not changed.

As the bill now reads, it says:

Leaves of absence authorized under this subsection shall not constitute a leave system, and no such leave of absence which is not used shall be made the basis for any lump-sum payment.

The only possibility of abuse, as I see it, is that the President might grant leaves of absence for a longer period than somebody else thinks he should.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is already the law, why go through all this now and reenact it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am calling the attention of the gentleman to again is that under the present law a member of the Cabinet, if he wants to, can take leave, but we are saying here that he cannot get any lump-sum pay-

ment if he does take it. Under what you are doing now, unless you pass this act, you are allowing it, and they have been doing it, and that is drawing these lump-sum payments.

Mr. THOMAS. Under the present law, after January 1, 1943, supposing any calendar year comes up beginning July 1, and on that date one of these officials—I understand there are some 250 or 300 of them—is granted a leave of absence for 1 year, and he takes it, do you mean that under your amendment here he does not get his accumulated leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He gets no money.

Mr. THOMAS. What does he get, then? He is paid for the entire year, is he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He gets his salary, of course, but he will not get any lump-sum payment.

Mr. THOMAS. Because he has not earned any.

Mr. SCOTT. May I submit that while he is granted this leave, the leave may be granted for a purpose which is entirely within the interest of rendering the best service to the Government of the United States. The leave may be granted to permit an individual to serve temporarily in the armed services or as a consultant or adviser under some leave system other than this. The purpose of providing this is that if you did not have such a provision—consider the negative of it—the question would arise whether such an officer or employee might not find himself in a position where he could not take any leave with pay under any circumstances, and the President, who might require his services in some other capacity, would not be empowered to grant him a leave of absence even, as one gentleman said, of 13 days, unless this provision were in the bill. That is why it is there, as I understand it.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLARDY. I am almost constrained to go along with our brothers on the other side on one point although I am going to support the bill and the point the gentleman is discussing, because I think he is right.

My criticism of the bill is that it does not go far enough. I have been appalled ever since the scandal developed in which so much was drawn down apparently under authority of the Congress. I am hopeful that this will not be the last of the efforts to cut this thing off. You have gone practically only into the upper levels. I think it ought to be extended all the way. I thought, as one who was merely paying taxes out in my district, that the original purpose of the leave was to protect the health of the people who should have some surcease from their arduous labors here in Washington. Apparently it is being used merely to milk the Treasury. So I hope my good friend from Pennsylvania will introduce another bill or at least consent to some sort of amendment that will cover everybody from top to bottom.

Mr. SCOTT. I conceive this to be a bill to protect the taxpayer's health. I

think that if this abuse cost the taxpayers over \$750,000 it is time we gave some consideration to the more and more sensitive pocketbook nerve of the taxpayer.

May I add this comment to what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said earlier today. Perhaps the complaint which we hear on the other side of the aisle to the effect that we are not doing enough is a sort of inverse expression of their true feelings.

Mr. CLARDY. They should have thought about it earlier.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. Perhaps what they are really complaining about is that we may move a little too fast and save too much money, and the contrast between the 100 days and the 20 years will be so startling, so illuminating to the American people, that when the facts begin to speak for themselves they hope to have some counterpropaganda available for the use of the Democratic National Committee. I think that is possibly the reason for that outburst of yesterday on the part of some of our Democratic colleagues.

Mr. CLARDY. I would like to commend the effort. My complaint is that it does not go quite far enough.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to clarify a little more the situation discussed by the gentleman from Texas. There are two things we are doing here with respect to this paragraph. One is that at least the department head would get the consent of the President. He does not have to do it now. He takes his time off.

Mr. SCOTT. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We agree he draws his salary even though he is not there, but he does not get the lump-sum payment in addition thereto.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, the discussion now before the House is for a rule to call up a bill, which I think is an excellent bill. I am for it. This bill deals with a limited class of people. This does not affect all of the civil-service people who are employees of the Government. It applies to only a limited group—to perhaps 250 or 300. The purpose of the bill is to tighten up the conditions under which the high-salaried people in the Government have been working, and under which they recently drew what seemed to many people to be an exorbitant amount of money when they left the Government.

But, in all fairness, let us consider the fact that this should not have been a surprise to any Member of the Congress or to anyone else who kept up with the law. The law authorizes these payments very clearly. The question had been brought up in the courts, and there is at least one decision of the Federal court which says that these had the right to accumulate leave and to get a cash payment in lieu thereof. We, in the committee, as well as others in the Congress and the people generally, do not feel that this should

be done. Therefore, this bill provides that these Presidential appointees cannot in the future accumulate leave, and that they must get permission from their superior officer, who, in this case, is the President, before they take a vacation.

That is not the situation now. It is doubtful whether there was any accounting of leave in many cases of the people who drew these large amounts. This bill would at least establish a responsibility in such instances.

I can understand, I believe, the feeling of the people who think this was an improper thing when the officers of the Government who collected these amounts of money for accumulated leave were people who, as the public generally believes, did not need the money and were in high-salaried brackets. But, after all, it was an ethical matter. It was a matter which was entirely within their right to decide. If any one of these men had stayed off the job for a year's time without doing a lick of work, without even the necessity of obtaining the permission of the President, and if such a person had not been discharged or relieved from his assignment by the President, he still could have drawn his salary. So that is the loose condition of the law, and has been since 1944. It was undoubtedly known to Members of Congress who have been here for a long time. It should have been known to everybody because it had been a subject of decision of the Federal court. It could have been amended in any Congress since 1944.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REAMS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say that this part of the law which enabled these payments to be made, and which justified such payments, was passed in the second session of the 78th Congress. The bill came up by unanimous consent in this body and was passed by unanimous consent. I have the record in my hand. The record shows that our former colleague, Mr. Ramspeck, asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, H. R. 4918, to provide for the payment to certain Government employees of accumulated or accrued annual leave due to their separation from the Government service. That is the law and it was brought up by unanimous consent, and passed by this body. So the fault lies with the Congress, and any man who received his money, received it under that law. They were not all Democrats, I can assure you of that much. Some whose names were not mentioned, one who is a member of the Cabinet at the present time, received the annual leave or termination pay. They were entitled to it and I defend their right to it. But the question of the correction of such a law is another thing, and as the gentleman well says, the law authorizing such payment was acted upon by the Congress and passed by the Congress. So far as this House is concerned, it was brought up by unanimous consent and passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a brief observation?

Mr. REAMS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is attempting to say that every action of the Congress is to be defended and is not subject to amendment when abuses develop.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts never said that. The gentleman from Massachusetts confirmed what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] said, that these men collected their money in accordance with the law and under the law. I called the attention of the House to the fact that the law was passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. REAMS. My position is not to defend anyone who took this money, nor is it to chastise them. It is merely to state that it is an ethical question. The enforcement of ethics is from within and not from without. Therefore, I think we can pass that question of whether or not this was a legal practice, because it very definitely was.

As was stated by my chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the committee has unanimously decided that whether it is ethical and proper or not, and most of them felt it was not proper to take this money—we are here to stop that situation right now.

May I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that I feel this does not open the door wider, because this bill deals with a limited class. I think the Congress does not want to encroach on the authority of the President too far. If we lay down rules by which the President must regulate his Cabinet to too great an extent, we are going to destroy the balance of government. This bill seeks to maintain that balance in a way that is effective and proper. If a member of the Cabinet must go to the President and say he wants to take a leave, and if he cannot accumulate it, and he cannot take it in cash, that goes about as far as I want to go in circumscribing the President's authority.

I believe that this is a good bill. It has been carefully considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I strongly urge that the rule be adopted and the bill be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we might just as well know what we are doing today. In view of a lot of publicity that preceded this bill, I think the Record should definitely show whether the Congress was right or wrong several sessions ago. The Congress passed the law under which any person who received their annual leave got it. Prior to the act of 1944 it was confined to employees. The act of 1944 broadened it to include officials. The gentleman from Kansas is aware of it. Whether or not the law from 1944 on is correct, men can honestly differ. But the fact that anyone who ob-

tained his terminal leave was strictly within his legal rights is not to be questioned.

I have no objection to this particular bill if my Republican friends want to put it through. I have no objection to paragraph (c) on page 2, that the gentleman from Texas referred to. I think there is a point in what he says. But I have enough confidence in any man who is President of the United States to know that when he authorizes leave of absence with pay to any officer or employee, that he is going to do it when the circumstances justify it, and he is going to apply the rule of reasonableness. I do not offer it as a suggestion, but if one wanted to be sure, he could put the word "reasonable" before "leave of absence" in line 15 on page 2. I am not going to offer it because I have confidence that the President of the United States or whoever he might delegate this authority to will apply the rule of reasonableness. If however something express is desired I think the word "reasonable" before the word "leaves" would probably be a word not only constituting direction but also a word of limitation.

These men are not getting their annual leave to their credit—and they have problems, they are sick at times, and certainly they are entitled to some kind of fair and justifiable consideration; so that part of it does not disturb me, except I recognize that some might abuse it, and it is abuses that bring about these conditions, although I see no abuses so far as anyone being paid what they were entitled to under the law.

Whether or not we want the law to apply to Cabinet officers, Ambassadors, and others covered by the present law is a matter for the Congress to pass upon, and I can see where some Members might be disturbed. But insofar as I am concerned I am not going to be disturbed about it. I think, however, that paragraph (c) of section 2 in some form is vitally important to prevent injustice to this group of officials who are affected by the bill, who have problems in relation to sickness arising, where they are working long hours, as they do. Certainly, Cabinet officers are not confined to certain hours a day, as we all know; nor Ambassadors, nor other officials covered by this bill and there ought to be, in justice to them, some kind of compensatory consideration, and I think the provisions of paragraph (c) are justified for that purpose and justifiably so. If, however, someone wants to insert the word "reasonable" before the word "leaves" I see no objection to it; but I am not going to offer the amendment because I think the language contained in the bill will be carried out in a reasonable way by any man who is the President of the United States, and at the present time it is President Eisenhower.

When the excitement arose I made some inquiries. I found that the subcommittee on Independent Offices making an inquiry about those who received these payments confined it to those occupying the grade of GS-15 or above, confined it to the period between November 1, 1952, and February 15, 1953, and to those who received more than

\$1,000. Now, they have been receiving it since 1944. It might be interesting to find out if somebody is curious, because what they got they got under the law, what they received—who received amounts prior to November 1, 1952. Furthermore, it might be interesting to inquire who on the Cabinet level, or on the Little Cabinet level, or in the level of GS-15 or above received from \$500 up to \$1,000 between November 1, 1952, and February 1953.

I take the position that these men received what the law entitled them to, no matter who they are.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think that the Congress intended when they enacted that law in 1944, for example, that the postmaster of New York should get \$10,000 in addition to his salary? I am asking what the gentleman thinks? What did he think when he voted for the thing? Did the gentleman think we were doing that sort of thing?

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not talking about what we thought on that occasion; we are talking about the interpretation of the language of Congress. Where the language of the bill is plain and capable of but one construction the intent of Congress does not enter into it; it is the plain language of the bill itself that is determinative. Where there is ambiguity it is another matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Having paid \$700,000 to these individuals does the gentleman think we ought to change it now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not arguing with the gentleman on that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think we ought to recommend that payment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, the Comptroller General says it is the law, but I am telling the gentleman I do not think it was the intent of Congress to pass such an act.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no argument with the gentleman on that as far as that is concerned, but the plain language of the law is such that there was no other construction that could be placed upon it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now we are trying to stop this abuse.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, if you want to stop it, that is all right with me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman want to stop it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not know. The only reason I would vote for this bill is because paragraph (c), page 2, is in there. If you are going to take these men out of annual leave and permit all the other officers, officials, and employees to remain in, take this group out that works long hours, they ought to have something of a compensatory nature, and paragraph (c) gives it. With paragraph (c) in there certainly I will support the bill if my Republican friends want the bill to go through.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They do.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. I will vote for it, then. I am not too excited about it, because, to me, the whole thing

leading up to the bill was nothing but political demagoguery anyway.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield to the gentleman because of my respect for him and because of other reasons that prompt me to have a very fine regard for the gentleman, even when I disagree with him.

Mr. SCOTT. I assure the gentleman I only want to be helpful, for I am quite aware of the fact that the gentleman is very generous in his willingness to have the law amended now that the boys on his side have received their money. I think that is a very fine gesture.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are doing it. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not doing it. That is why I said, if you want to do it, why I have no objection to doing it. That is your funeral, not mine. One thing is certain, however, anyone who received money under this act got it in accordance with the law. The legality of the act is not challenged.

I was very much interested to find that the inquiry of the Subcommittee on Appropriations was confined to those who received more than \$1,000, to those who were in grade GS-15 or higher, and confined to the period between November 1, 1952, and February 15, 1953. There were over 100 names referred to in GS-15 to GS-18 under the Classification Act. They were career employees. There was an awful lot of publicity about a few Democratic members of the Cabinet who received payment. But they did not get one member. There is one they did not find who received \$1,000 or more. He was not on the list. They were very much concerned, at least somebody was, because on page 491, part 2, of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1954, an inquiry was made about this particular man. They did not find his name on the list, although he was a Democratic member of the Cabinet. So they asked particularly about this man. The reason his name was on the list is because he got \$914.07. But there was another member of the Cabinet today in the present administration, who received \$852.50 and took it. I do not blame him. He was entitled to it under the law. But my Republican friends were searching for Democrats; they were not looking for Republicans, and that is why they confined it to grades GS-15 and above, and that is why they confined it to a particular period. That is why they said, "Those who received more than a thousand dollars." When they found one man was not on that list, they made specific inquiry about him, and they were very careful to put it into the record of the hearing.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that he has always been thoughtful and very generous in sponsoring legislation, and I appreciate that fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, wait a minute. I am suspicious. The gentleman said I am very generous. Then what?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I said the gentleman has been very generous in sponsoring legislation for increased salaries. I feel very sure he is interested in seeing that everybody shall get their full share under the law, and I agree with the gentleman. But, on the other hand, will not the gentleman agree with me, as long as I have gone so far with him that, as a matter of fact, when this law was written it was never contemplated it would be used by Cabinet officials? It somewhat reminds me of a story. Oh, I know it is in the law. My distinguished friend need not remind me of that. It reminds me a little of the story of a lady whose neighbor came running in. The neighbor said: "You have got to take those peashooters away from your children. They are shooting peas up their noses." The mother said, "I am very sorry, I never contemplated they would do that." There are some things that you cannot contemplate, and I am sure the very distinguished minority leader—

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. Wait a minute now.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is going to go along with us on this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assistant minority leader or whip. I have too much affection for my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to encroach on his jurisdiction.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I beg your pardon. Of course, I certainly would not want to make that error. But, on the other hand, I always look upon the gentleman with great respect and as a leader, because we serve on the same committee, and may I say we all work very well together on that committee. I am very happy to hear that in the final analysis the gentleman is going to vote for this slight change and excellent amendment to the legislation, which, frankly, will not affect anyone that the gentleman is particularly interested in.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman from New York that if there was any doubt in my mind before as to how I was going to vote on this bill, that by reason of the eloquence and convincing argument that she just made I, at least, will reluctantly go along. I have no opposition to the bill because my Republican friends want it, but I want to call attention to the fact that the law of 1944 plainly included these officials. As to what the intent was, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Kansas, but I know that where the law is clear and unambiguous it is not the intent of the Congress that governs but it is the plain wording of the law that governs the situation, and that all of them, so far as I know, Democrats and Republicans, who were entitled to it, received payments and they were entitled to it under the law, and I do not think that they were subject to criticism. So far as I am concerned, I know that prominent Republicans in the employ of the Government during the Democratic administration received their terminal leave pay, and I have not one word of criticism to offer to that as long as the present law is upon the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this bill came before the Committee on Rules with the full and complete endorsement of both the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the ranking member of the same committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. I have great confidence in both of those gentlemen. When you deal with the civil-service law, you deal with a very technical subject, and while there can always be a lot of argument about that, so far as I can see, from the debate that has taken place here this morning, there is no real objection to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the rule and I favor the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute at this time to set the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] straight on this matter. He seemed to be a little concerned about it, and I think it ought to be pointed out, as in effect he did point out, that the then administration in 1944 simply included in the benefits of these lump-sum payments some of the top brass who had not been included, and that the present majority, which is the party of the little people, has taken the benefit away from the top brass but has assiduously preserved these benefits for those in the brackets below the amounts referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, at least twice in his remarks the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts raised the point and seemed to be disturbed because the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee had sought the information about the lump-sum payments drawn by high-ranking officials, and had not filled up the RECORD with the whole body of Federal employees.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about the reason for that, let me remind the Members of the House that if those in humble status, the workers down in the departments, are away from their duties they must use their annual leave. When they are away from the office it is taken out of their leave. But we all know that high-ranking officials may be away from their offices without having the time charged up against their leave. They may call up their office in the morning when they are out of town. They may even be campaigning on the Pacific Coast; yet their annual leave continues to accrue. I do not say they did wrong but I do say the people have a right to know about it and it is time Congress stopped it.

That is the reason we were interested in that type of official. There is no objection to filling up the whole RECORD with the statistics about employees in the lower grades but we were more interested in the high brass. We found that Cabinet officers retired and drew \$6,000, \$5,000, or \$4,000 in lump sums. Of course they have great responsibilities, but if they are entitled to more pay they should be paid in the legitimate way; by a bill

passed through the Congress, and not by this back-door method.

The only reason the Independent Offices Subcommittee confined their request to the high-ranking officers was that when these are away from their offices it is almost never deducted from their accruing annual leave. The lower grade employees did not enjoy that advantage.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4654, with Mr. ELLSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill has been pretty well discussed and explained under the rule, although there may be just a few misunderstandings with regard to it.

It is admitted that the 1944 act as approved by the House has been construed by the General Accounting Office to include Cabinet officers and other appointees of the President of the United States, so it is admitted, I think, that under that construction of the 1944 act the people who are described in the report of the House Appropriations Committee were legally entitled to terminal leave provided they did not use up their leave while in office. Some of them took time off and some of them did not. They were entitled to take time off the same as other employees. If they did take the time, then, of course, they would be entitled under the law, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has so eminently stated, to a check. What I tried to inquire of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, was whether he thought when that act was passed, that these members of the Cabinet, and these people in the higher echelon would receive \$700,000. There were only 215 of them, and they took \$700,000 when they left their jobs. This act was passed in 1944. You know it was passed during the war period, and it was intended, as explained by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who brought the thing to the floor, to keep employees in government and on the job. It was regarded as more or less of a so-called war measure. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees with me that when that act was approved, we did not intend to pay Cabinet officers thousands of dollars of extra money when they left their positions. I do not think he thought that at the time any more than I did. The Comptroller General has construed the law,

and we agree that, under the law, these people were entitled, if they kept a record of their time for which they were entitled, to receive payment with respect to this matter of leave. Nearly all employees of the Government, in fact all of them except Presidential appointees have records kept of the amount of leave they take. So there is a sheet for each one of them in his file to indicate whether he took any leave at all, and if so, the amount that he took. I think that is the thing that ought to be explained.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot take issue with the gentleman's statement. I think that represents a fair state of mind. But, I think my friend will agree with me that no matter what the Congress intended in 1944 with reference to a certain group of officials, the law plainly included them. Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. But this looks like an abuse; does it not? You know what I mean. For example, I do not believe that you or I, at the time of the approval of the legislation, thought we were approving bonuses for Cabinet members and other high-ranking Presidential appointees, many of whom were millionaires in their own right.

Mr. McCORMACK. But my friend is avoiding my question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All right, go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I frankly said that I agree, and I think the gentleman's statement represents a fair state of mind. I agree that the gentleman's statement is a fair one as to the probable state of mind in 1944 when the bill was taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the law was plain that they were covered. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the fault lies with the Congress in passing a law which included them; is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. And now we are trying to correct that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all right, but the fault lies, if there is any fault at all, with the Congress in 1944.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it passed unanimously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then you and I have a meeting of the minds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. But what I am trying to get across is I do not believe, and in my opinion neither did the gentleman from Massachusetts who at that time was the floor leader of the House, and managed the legislation, believe, lump sum leave payments were thereby authorized for high Government officials.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, and you helped too. You helped it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, of course, you might express it that way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure, we all did. We all take our responsibility. I will take mine. Do you take yours?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will take my responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, fine—then you and I can shake hands on that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We can always shake hands.

Mr. McCORMACK. But let us not kid the public. I do not say you are, but let the public understand that the law provided for these payments.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and the Congress passed the law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] are taking all the responsibility, because there are a few of us around here who were not in Congress in 1944.

I wonder if the gentleman is overlooking Oscar Ewing, who left this country last November, ostensibly to go to a health conference in India, and came back here last January 15, taking a tour around the world meanwhile, and then collected some \$4,000 in accumulated leave pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, Mr. Ewing drew a good-sized check, and so did several of the others. As the gentleman has said, by the terms of the legislation such payments were not prohibited. But even so, in my judgment it was an abuse to do that sort of thing. It just was not the right thing to do. I think the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was glad we agree on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I think section (c) is very important.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They ought not to have claimed it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Congress should not have done it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, these men should not have taken the money.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, now, do not try to avoid our responsibility. The Congress passed this law in 1944. The gentleman from Iowa is correct, when he says he was not here. I am talking about the Members who were here. The language is plain. There is no ambiguity. There is only one construction that could be placed on it. The law is plain. You cannot go into the intent of Congress. It is only when there is uncertainty or ambiguity that you can go into the intent of Congress. This language was plain. These men accepted it. And there were Republicans.

Mr. REES of Kansas. A few.

Mr. McCORMACK. A few, and some not named. You did not go back far enough. In that period it was confined to \$1,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We will not go into the politics of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. But you did.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If there were any Republicans in there, they were down in the lower bracket.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Is it not true that the 1944 act, to which reference has been made, did not specifically include the term "Cabinet officers," and that the inclusion of Cabinet officers was by a ruling made by the General Accounting Office, interpreting the language "civilian officers" to include Cabinet officers?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct. The 1944 act did not specifically name Cabinet officers; it did not include appointees of the President, except by interpretation placed upon it by the Comptroller General.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I gladly yield to the distinguished Member from California, who was a member of our committee at the time the legislation was approved, and I am glad to know that he is for this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is it not true that the Comptroller General is an officer of the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I just wanted my friend from North Carolina to know that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes; and a distinguished officer, too. None better in the Government.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is very much concerned because the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee did not go back of November 1. I am not a member of that committee, but I suspect it would have been even more embarrassing for certain people if they had gone back of November 1.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, because of the shortage of time, I would like to continue my statement without interruption. To clear the air as a result of this interrogation, I believe the people of the country will want to know some of the circumstances surrounding the passage of the 1944 act. As it was presented to our committee, plans were being made for reductions in force throughout the Government at the termination of World War II.

These plans were to pay in a lump sum terminal leave to employees who, during World War II, had remained faithful to their jobs and had not taken their leave. We were carrying over 3 million Federal employees then on the rolls. We planned and actually did reduce the number of employees from 1946 to 1948 from over 3 million to slightly under 2 million. The law of 1944 was planned to meet the situation of the 1 million Federal employees separated from the rolls. The fact that it also included the 300 people we are now excluding from the Leave Act today was merely incidental.

I am willing to accept my responsibility, as I have said, but as the Members know, part of the responsibility belongs to the administrative agencies who recommended this means of settling for accrued leave. The record is completely

void of any reference from them to the fact that they were also talking about themselves—that is, the top-ranking officials in the Government.

Let me repeat that the 1944 act was brought to the floor with the justification that the legislation was to take care of workers in the Government who had not had an opportunity to take their leave during World War II.

And one thing further, these people, these high-ranking officials, appointed by the President, as I told you at the beginning, are in a different group from other Government employees and have so been held by the courts.

H. R. 4654, when enacted into law, will prevent lump-sum leave payments to department and agency heads. By exempting from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 Cabinet officers and other high-ranking Government officials, appointed by the President alone or by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, we will preclude such officials from earning leave. Also, they will not be able to accrue leave which can be used as a basis for lump-sum leave payments when they terminate their Government service.

It was the view of our committee in approving this legislation that we should not consider Cabinet officers and others affected by the bill in the same category of those who must keep detailed leave statements and, certainly, not in the category of those who should receive large lump-sum payments as a result of leave accrued during their specific terms of office. When such large lump-sum leave payments are made, we have really created a situation whereby we are paying for two officeholders at the same time when only one such office exists. By removing these officials from the Sick and Annual Leave Act of 1951, these officials will not be able to accrue any leave which will be the subject of lump-sum payments after they have left office.

The Assistant Comptroller General testified before our committee that, in his opinion, these officials presently on the rolls are entitled to be paid their accrued annual leave up to the time legislation exempting them from the leave act is approved. Our committee wanted to make sure that if they were entitled to such leave, it would not be paid upon the passage of this act. Therefore, a restriction was added to the bill providing that the payments of such leave as these officials may be entitled to receive would not be made until they were actually separated from the Federal service.

In operation, the bill will immediately exempt from the general leave system approximately 245 officials who were appointed by the President alone, or by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who are presently receiving salaries in excess of \$14,800 a year. It also will exempt approximately 71 Chiefs of Missions in the Foreign Service appointed and assigned by the President who are paid \$15,000 or more a year.

This bill does not solve the whole problem of lump-sum payments of leave to officials who approve their own leave. I have pointed out previously to the House that there are some postmasters

who have walked off with large lump-sum annual-leave payments. For example, the postmaster at New York City was paid more than \$10,000 in lump-sum on the termination of his service recently. He resigned, as the Members will recall, while his office was under investigation.

I have asked the Postmaster General to take aggressive and effective action to reduce the total amount of annual leave presently outstanding to postmasters. It is my understanding that this amounts to an indebtedness to the postal service of between \$30 million and \$50 million. I have learned directly from the Postmaster General that he is exploring this problem and intends to do something about it. It can be seen that in the case of those postmasters who are not replaced when they are on leave, it is more important to insist that they use up their accrued leave than to exclude them from the Sick and Annual Leave Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this bill H. R. 4654 was reported out unanimously by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The committee held hearings for 2 days and had numerous witnesses before the committee before a unanimous decision was reached to report this bill out favorably.

It is good legislation. This bill exempts from the 1951 Leave Act any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate or by the President alone, and chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service and comprises a total of 316 officers, 245 of those officers who are exempted from the 1951 Leave Act are appointed by the President alone, or by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Seventy-one of them are chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service. So this bill provides that these 316 officials shall be taken out of the 1951 Leave Act and are not to be entitled to any leave or any lump-sum payment under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

But the bill goes further and provides in section (c) that the President in his discretion shall give such annual leave to these 316 officers as he deems advisable and proper. This section also provides, however, that under no circumstance shall any of these 316 officers be entitled to any lump-sum payment for any accrued leave when they leave the service of the Government.

The purpose of this legislation is to discontinue lump-sum payments for accrued leave to members of the Cabinet and other high-ranking officials of our Government who are appointed by the President alone or by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and chiefs of mission of the Foreign Service when they retire or resign.

I am not questioning the legality of the payment of certain lump sum leave payments to certain members of the

Cabinet and other high-ranking officials who retired or resigned last January. I think unquestionably they were entitled to it if they had actually accumulated the leave for which they were paid. The act of 1951 specifically includes all civilian officers and employees; and, certainly, members of the Cabinet, assistant members of the Cabinet, and other top-ranking employees who received these payments were civilian officers of our Government and were included in the 1951 leave act. I think as long as they established the amount of leave they had accumulated by not using same before they left the service of the Government then they were entitled to the lump-sum payment under this 1951 leave act. So there is no question about the legality of those lump-sum payments according to the ruling or decision of the Comptroller General.

The only question is whether or not we shall continue to pay these large lump-sum payments to Cabinet members and other top-ranking officials in the future. I do not think we should. Your Post Office and Civil Service Committee which had this legislation under consideration is unanimously of the opinion that we should not. I am sure there is no objection to this bill. I trust it will be passed without a dissenting vote because it is a deserving piece of legislation and is in the interest of efficient, economical administration of the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this legislation grows out of moral abuses of the law as it presently exists.

I supported this legislation in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and I support it now even though it is my feeling that it does not go as far as it should in prohibiting cash payments for accumulated leave.

It is, at least, a start in the right direction, and I hope the Members of the House will give approval to the enactment of this measure.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to impose on the committee, but being a member of the committee that considered the bill and reported it I feel that it is my duty to state my reasons for supporting the bill.

I am supporting H. R. 4654 from my committee on the basis of economy, that it will cut out a small part of the wasteful spending of the taxpayers' money. These people who are taken from coverage by the Annual Leave Act of 1951 by this bill take all the leave they need or want. They are officers who are paid their salaries whether or not they even come to their offices and however they spend their time. One of the most important things this Congress must do, and this bill is a short step in that direction, is to eliminate the wasteful and reckless spending that is being done by this Government. I do not think that needs discussion. I would be the last to begrudge any necessary or useful expenditure or tax, but we see \$22,500 per

year set up for salary for a Cabinet officer. That is what we expect to pay out for that purpose. Yet this year the cost of salary for each of the 10 Cabinet officers is going to run up as high as \$29,500 because of the situation that this bill will remedy. I hope it also remedies the condition that causes an office in the State Department to cost \$37,560.12 when it is supposed to cost \$25,000. These two items are taken from a list that shows about three-quarters of a million dollars paid out recently in sums of \$1,000 or more. I do not know what the total of the amounts is that was paid to lesser recipients. We know that our Republic can be more surely destroyed by waste than it can be by war. We must acknowledge that the resources of this country have limits and that wasteful, reckless and excessive spending, and the runaway taxation that it brings on, are just as dangerous to our way of life as any external threat. That renowned Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, said, and I quote:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

That should be our philosophy today but I fear that we have strayed. By passing this bill we can eliminate a small part of the waste.

I feel that our committee is bipartisan, at least to a great extent, and I certainly hope this bill is. It should be. I know that I have sat here on the floor and listened to some of our beloved colleagues of both parties belabor the members of the other party on the apparent hypothesis that because I am a Democrat I will vote opposite to all the Republicans, or that because somebody else is a Republican that he will vote for a bill because another Republican sponsored it or against a bill because a Democrat introduced it.

The United States of America has come upon sad days if the time has arrived when the Members of this Congress have put the welfare of the political party over the welfare of the Nation. That would be a betrayal of our people. It will be my continual prayer, as long as I am a Member of this great body, that God shall give me the wisdom and the courage to always put our national welfare first and foremost. He will do that and through that same faith we must regain the moral and spiritual strength that made us the greatest nation on earth. I sometimes wonder if our Nation's Capital has come to rely upon money and personal and political power and has forgotten that this Nation was founded upon faith in God.

During the debate concerning the authorization for an Undersecretary of State for administration, which was one of the first matters voted upon at this session, I sat here in amazement and astonishment and heard advanced as the reason for providing such an office was to be able to pay the appointee a larger salary and to give him a new title in order that by virtue of the title and the bigger salary he would have prestige. Prestige, mind you, was what they were

looking for. Is prestige of a title the thing that runs our Government? The statement was made that the man must be able to have that prestige of a title when he goes over to talk to Mr. Wilson of the Defense Department, and that is substantially quoting from the debate. I was one of the eighteen who voted against the proposal, and I want it known here and now that nobody has to have a title to come to see me. The girls in my office were informed when they were employed that when any one comes to talk to me I will see them, and that is regardless of prestige. But that man, desiring that prestige that costs the taxpayers \$17,500 per year for his salary plus the salaries for a corps of secretaries and so forth, will be covered by this bill so when he leaves the Government he will not be allowed to pull down another three, four or five thousand dollars for leave. There are over 300 others like him. In my opinion, this bill should pass.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I just want to pay tribute to the members of our committee for their interest in this legislation and for their attendance during the hearings, and the fact that we have a unanimous agreement among the members of the committee in support of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, one of the most amazing documents of this or any other Congress was the report of the chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee on cash leave payments made to Cabinet officers and other high officials of the last administration when they stepped out of office. Substantial amounts of the taxpayers' money were handed over to these ex-officers on the theory that they had not used annual leave to which they were entitled. These payments reached lavish proportions in a number of cases.

I, for one, was deeply shocked at the revelation of these payments, and am well aware of the grave concern of the public at the granting of such gratuities. We had instance after instance of Cabinet officers and other high-level appointees who received four thousand, five thousand, or six thousand dollars—and one even received \$12,000—as going-away presents when they were swept out of office by the American people as the result of the last election.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am a member, has taken prompt and effective action to correct this sorry situation by reporting H. R. 4654 unanimously. Under this legislation, there will be no recurrence of the recent situation where two-hundred-odd top officials can pick up almost three-fourths of a million dollars for supposedly unused annual leave. It will do this by removing Cabinet officers, their assistants, and certain other high officials from the leave system that covers Federal employees generally. About 316 officers will be removed from the leave system, and once this is done, they will no longer be able to accumulate leave so as to become eligible for lump-sum cash payments if they do not use it.

It should be noted, however, that this legislation will not, and certainly should

not, reduce the leave privileges of rank-and-file Government officers and employees. The great majority of career Government employees are conscientious and hard-working public servants, and should not be deprived of benefits justly due them because of abuses which have occurred in the higher echelon, and particularly among political appointees of the previous administration. It is only a certain group of appointive officials whose salaries exceed the highest general schedule rate—presently \$14,800 a year—who will be deprived of the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 which covers Federal employees generally. Employees whose salary rates do not exceed this top rate will continue to receive all benefits of that leave act.

I should like to point out the factors which, in my estimation, have combined to permit the lump-sum leave payments to high officials which will be precluded under H. R. 4654. I have no quarrel with the legal conclusion, reached by the Comptroller General of the United States, that these payments could not be questioned by his office. The Assistant Comptroller General testified that the law clearly authorizes the payments. Nevertheless, it is even more clear to me that it is just an accidental quirk of the law, an unintentional loophole in the leave statutes, which forms the basis for the payments.

In 1936 Congress authorized annual leave of 26 days a year for civilian officers and employees of the Government, with the privilege of accumulating up to 60 days of such leave. The 60-day maximum was increased to 90 days during World War II when the national interest precluded normal use of leave.

The 1936 law was repealed and replaced by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. This 1951 act created a graduated scale of leave allowances for civilian officers and employees of the Government, allowing 13 days for those with less than 3 years' service, 20 days for those having 3 years but less than 15 years of service, and 26 days for those having 15 years or more of service. Neither this act nor the previous one made any distinction between leave allowances to various classes of civilian officers and employees, although there were several specific exceptions.

In 1944 a law was enacted authorizing lump-sum payments for annual leave which remained unused when an officer or employee became separated from the service. This law covered both officers and employees, but the explanation in the House report—House Report 1836, 78th Congress—after stating that the purpose is to authorize lump-sum payments to any officer or employee who is separated, goes on to deal exclusively and at considerable length with the situation with respect to employees which forms the underlying reason for the legislation.

I recognize, of course, that we cannot go behind the plain words of a statute where they are unambiguous, as in this case. At the same time I submit that we most certainly must also give recognition, in considering the desirability of remedial legislation such as H. R. 4654, to the self-evident fact that Congress never intended this 1944 lump-sum

leave act to have the effect it did with respect to high officials. In other words, I am morally certain that this 1944 bill would not even have reached the floor of the House, much less become law, had the full implications thereof been made clear to the Congress by the operating departments who urged enactment of the law. Congress certainly never intended that this law would be used to dish out and give away huge sums to officials serving at the pleasure of the President or for fixed terms.

H. R. 4654 will correct this weakness in the present law. At the same time it will not reduce the rights of the great majority of loyal, hardworking Federal employees. I heartily endorse this measure in the interests of good Government and of the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 202 (b) (1) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (H), and by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(J) any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rate of basic compensation exceeds the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Subparagraph (J) shall not apply to the personnel of the Foreign Service of the United States."

(b) Section 202 (b) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) This title, except section 203 (f), shall not apply to chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service of the United States who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C., sec. 866)."

(c) The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence with pay to any officers and employees who are exempted in whole or in part from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act. This subsection shall not affect leaves of absence which may be granted to chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service of the United States under section 203 (f) of such act.

SEC. 2. (a) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any officer or employee exempted in whole or in part from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to such date only upon (1) the separation of such officer or employee from the service, (2) the death of such officer or employee, or (3) the transfer of such officer or employee to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(b) In the event any such exempted officer or employee, without any break in the continuity of his service, again becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 upon the completion of his service as an exempted officer or employee, such officer or employee shall be entitled to the annual and sick leave to which he is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him, in the same manner and

to the same extent as though he had been continuously subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(c) In the event any such exempted officer or employee is separated from the service to enter upon active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, such officer or employee shall be entitled (1) to receive compensation covering the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which he is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him, or (2) to elect to have such leave remain to his credit until his return from active service in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, after "act," insert "Leaves of absence authorized under this subsection shall not constitute a leave system, and no such leave of absence which is not used shall be made the basis for any lump-sum payment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 223, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT, KITTY HAWK, N. C.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 241) to appoint a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the 1st airplane flight at Kill Devil Hill, Kitty Hawk, N. C.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas on December 17, 1903, Wilbur and Orville Wright made the first successful airplane flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.; and

Whereas suitable recognition will be accorded the 50th anniversary of this great historical event; and

Whereas it is both fitting and desirable for the Congress of the United States to be represented on the occasion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall each appoint 5 Members of their respective Houses and may each appoint 2 additional citizens to compose a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1953, and represent the Congress. The necessary expenses of said committee, including actual travel expenses, in an amount not to exceed \$10,000 shall be paid on a pro rata basis out of the contingent funds of the House and Senate based on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SCOTT. I doubt if this joint resolution will consume very much time. I have heard of no controversy on it. The resolution simply provides for the appointment of a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the first airplane flight at Kill Devil Hill, Kitty Hawk, N. C., which occurred on December 17, 1903, in the flight made by the Wright brothers, Wilbur and Orville.

The resolution cites that it is desirable that recognition be given to the event, and that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House each appoint 5 Members of their respective Houses and 2 additional citizens to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of this flight on December 17, 1953, and represent the Congress. It provides for the appropriation of the necessary expenses, but this amount has been reduced by the Committee on Rules from the \$10,000 suggested in the bill to \$4,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no objection to the amendment, and I do not want to consume any time. This was unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 8, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time. Therefore, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 135)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The purpose of the reorganization plan is to simplify the organization and strengthen the administration of the Export-Import Bank of Washington by providing for a single managing director at the head of the bank. The management of the Bank is now vested in a board of directors consisting of four full-time members and the Secretary of State, ex officio. The functions performed by the Board are essentially of an executive nature and are comparable to those vested in the heads of other executive agencies. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective performance of executive functions is more likely to be obtained under a single administrator than under a board.

The plan concentrates authority and responsibility for bank operations in the Managing Director. Safeguards are provided in the plan and in existing law, however, to assure that the bank follows, sound lending and financial policies and that its activities are coordinated with those of other Government agencies having international responsibilities. Under the plan, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems is authorized to establish the general lending and other financial policies which shall govern the operations of the bank. The Council is composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director for Mutual Security.

At present, the Board of Directors is not only subject to policy guidance by the National Advisory Council, under the provisions of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, but is also required to consult with the Advisory Board for the Export-Import Bank, created by the Export-Import Bank Act, on major questions of policy and to receive recommendations from that Board. The composition of the Advisory Board largely parallels that of the Council. The differences are that only the latter includes the Director for Mutual Security as a member and that the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank is the chairman of the Advisory Board whereas the Secretary of the Treasury serves as the chairman of the Council. Because of the similarity of the composition of the Advisory Board and Council, and of their functions as respects the bank, the reorganization plan abolishes the Advisory Board. It

also abolishes the functions of the Advisory Board—conferred by section 3 (d) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

The reorganization plan also provides for the abolition of the functions of the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington with respect to his membership on the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The function of membership is conferred upon the Chairman by section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended. I contemplate that the Managing Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington will participate as a nonvoting member of the National Advisory Council in relation to matters of concern to the bank. I believe there is merit in reducing the size of the Council and also believe that the interests of the bank can be properly placed before the Council without conferring full Council membership on the managing director of the bank.

Under the reorganization plan the Export-Import Bank of Washington will continue in its status of a corporate entity, and independent agency, in the executive branch of the Government. The President will retain authority to terminate or modify any delegation or assignment of function made by the President to the bank or to any of its agencies or officers.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I also have found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provision for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 1, 2, and 3 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1953 will accomplish a small immediate reduction of expenditures, since it will substitute one managing director, together with a deputy and assistant, for a board which includes four full-time members. Other reductions in expenditures will probably be brought about also, through increased economy and efficiency in the performance of necessary services of the bank resulting from the simplification of its organization, but such reductions cannot be itemized in advance of actual experience.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, April 30, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended.)

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

SECTION 1. The Managing Director: There is hereby established the office of Managing

Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, hereinafter referred to as the Managing Director. The Managing Director shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum.

SEC. 2. Deputy Director: There is hereby established the office of Deputy Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The Deputy Director shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$16,000 per annum, shall perform such functions as the Managing Director may from time to time prescribe, and shall act as Managing Director during the absence or disability of the Managing Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Managing Director.

SEC. 3. Assistant Director: There is hereby established the office of Assistant Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The Assistant Director shall be appointed by the Managing Director under the classified civil service, shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter fixed by law for grade GS-18 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall perform such functions as the Managing Director may from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 4. Functions transferred to the Managing Director: All functions of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington are hereby transferred to the Managing Director.

SEC. 5. General policies: The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall from time to time establish general lending and other financial policies which shall govern the Managing Director in the conduct of the lending and other financial operations of the bank.

SEC. 6. Performance of transferred functions: The Managing Director may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Managing Director by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the bank.

SEC. 7. Abolitions: The following are hereby abolished: (1) The Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, including the offices of the members thereof provided for in section 3 (a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; (2) the Advisory Board of the bank, together with the functions of the said Advisory Board; and (3) the function of the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington of being a member of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The Managing Director shall make such provisions as may be necessary for winding up any outstanding affairs of the said abolished boards and offices not otherwise provided for in this reorganization plan.

SEC. 8. Effective date: Sections 3 to 7, inclusive, of this reorganization plan shall become effective when the Managing Director first appointed hereunder enters upon office pursuant to the provisions of this reorganization plan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 136)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee

on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I address the Congress on a subject which has been of primary interest to me throughout all the years of my adult life—the defense of our country.

As a former soldier who has experienced modern war at first hand, and now, as President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, I believe that our Defense Establishment is in need of immediate improvement. In this message, I indicate actions which we are taking, and must yet take, to assure the greater safety of America.

Through the years, our Nation has ward off all enemies. We have defended ourselves successfully against those who have waged war against us. We enjoy, as a people, a proud tradition of triumph in battle.

We are not, however, a warlike people. Our historic goal is peace. It shall ever be peace—peace to enjoy the freedom we cherish and the fruits of our labors. We maintain strong military forces in support of this supreme purpose, for we believe that in today's world only properly organized strength may altogether avert war.

Because we are not a military-minded people, we have sometimes failed to give proper thought to the problems of the organization and adequacy of our Armed Forces. Past periods of international stress and the actual outbreaks of wars have found us poorly prepared. On such occasions, we have had to commit to battle insufficient and improperly organized military forces to hold the foe until our citizenry could be more fully mobilized and our resources marshaled. We know that we cannot permit a repetition of those conditions.

Today we live in a perilous period of international affairs. Soviet Russia and her allies have it within their power to join with us in the establishment of a true peace or to plunge the world into global war. To date, they have chosen to conduct themselves in such a way that these are years neither of total war nor total peace.

We in the United States have, therefore, recently embarked upon the definition of a new, positive foreign policy. One of our basic sins is to gain again for the free world the initiative in shaping the international conditions under which freedom can thrive. Essential to this endeavor is the assurance of an alert, efficient, ever-prepared Defense Establishment.

Today our international undertakings are shared by the free peoples of other nations. We find ourselves in an unparalleled role of leadership of freemen everywhere. With this leadership have come new responsibilities. With the basic purpose of assuring our own security and economic viability, we are helping our friends to protect their lives and liberties. And one major help that we may give them is reliance upon our own Military Establishment.

Today also witnesses one of history's times of swiftest advance in scientific achievements. These developments can

accomplish wonders in providing a healthier and happier life for us all. But, converted to military uses, they threaten new, more devastating terrors in war. These simple, inescapable facts make imperative the maintenance of a defense organization commanding the most modern technological instruments in our arsenal of weapons.

In providing the kind of military security that our country needs, we must keep our people free and our economy solvent. We must not endanger the very things we seek to defend. We must not create a nation mighty in arms that is lacking in liberty and bankrupt in resources. Our armed strength must continue to rise from the vigor of a free people and a prosperous economy.

Recognizing all these national and international demands upon our Military Establishment, we must remain ever mindful of three great objectives in organizing our defense.

First. Our Military Establishment must be founded upon our basic constitutional principles and traditions. There must be a clear and unchallenged civilian responsibility in the Defense Establishment. This is essential not only to maintain democratic institutions, but also to protect the integrity of the military profession. Basic decisions relating to the military forces must be made by politically accountable civilian officials. Conversely, professional military leaders must not be thrust into the political arena to become the prey of partisan politics. To guard these principles, we must recognize and respect the clear lines of responsibility and authority which run from the President, through the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments, over the operations of all branches of the Department of Defense.

Second. Effectiveness with economy must be made the watchwords of our defense effort. To maintain an adequate national defense for the indefinite future, we have found it necessary to devote a larger share of our national resources than any of us have heretofore anticipated. To protect our economy, maximum effectiveness at minimum cost is essential.

Third. We must develop the best possible military plans. These plans must be sound guides to action in case of war. They must incorporate the most competent and considered thinking from every point of view—military, scientific, industrial, and economic.

To strengthen civilian control by establishing clear lines of accountability, to further effectiveness with economy, and to provide adequate planning for military purposes—these were primary objectives of the Congress in enacting the National Security Act of 1947 and strengthening it in 1949.

Now much has happened which makes it appropriate to review the workings of those basic statutes. Valuable lessons have been learned through 6 years of trial by experience. Our top military structure has been observed under changing conditions. The military action in Korea, the buildup of our forces everywhere, the provision of military aid to other friendly nations, and the partici-

pation of United States Armed Forces in regional collective security arrangements, such as those under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—all these have supplied sharp tests of our military organization. Today, in making my specific recommendations, I have also had the benefit of the report prepared by the Committee on Department of Defense Organization established by the Secretary of Defense 3 months ago.

The time is here, then, to work to perfect our Military Establishment without delay.

The first objective—toward which immediate actions already are being directed—is clarification of lines of authority within the Department of Defense so as to strengthen civilian responsibility.

I am convinced that the fundamental structure of our Department of Defense and its various component agencies as provided by the National Security Act, as amended, is sound. None of the changes I am proposing affects that basic structure, and this first objective can and will be attained without any legislative change.

With my full support, the Secretary of Defense must exercise over the Department of Defense the direction, authority, and control which are vested in him by the National Security Act. He should do so through the basic channels of responsibility and authority prescribed in that act—through the three civilian Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, who are responsible to him for all aspects of the respective military departments (except for the legal responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the President in military matters). No function in any part of the Department of Defense, or in any of its component agencies, should be performed independent of the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary is the accountable civilian head of the Department of Defense, and, under the law, my principal assistant in all matters relating to the Department. I want all to know that he has my full backing in that role.

To clarify a point which has led to considerable confusion in the past, the Secretary of Defense, with my approval, will shortly issue a revision of that portion of the 1948 memorandum commonly known as the Key West agreement which provides for a system of designating executive agents for unified commands. Basic decisions with respect to the establishment and direction of unified commands are made by the President and the Secretary of Defense, upon the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their military planning and advisory role. But the provision of the Key West agreement, under which the Joint Chiefs of Staff designate one of their members as an executive agent for each unified command, has led to considerable confusion and misunderstanding with respect to the relationship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defense, and the relationship of the military chief of each service to the civilian Secretary of his military department.

Hence, the Secretary of Defense, with my approval, is revising the Key West agreement to provide that the Secretary of Defense shall designate in each case a military department to serve as the executive agent for a unified command. Under this new arrangement, the channel of responsibility and authority to a commander of a unified command will unmistakably be from the President to the Secretary of Defense to the designated civilian Secretary of a military department. This arrangement will fix responsibility along a definite channel of accountable civilian officials as intended by the National Security Act.

It will be understood, however, that, for the strategic direction and operational control of forces, and for the conduct of combat operations, the military chief of the designated military department will be authorized by the Secretary of Defense to receive and transmit reports and orders and to act for that department in its executive agency capacity. This arrangement will make it always possible to deal promptly with emergency or wartime situations. The military chief will clearly be acting in the name and by the direction of the Secretary of Defense. Promulgated orders will directly state that fact.

By taking this action to provide clearer lines of responsibility and authority for the exercise of civilian control, I believe we will make significant progress toward increasing proper accountability in the top levels of the Departments of Defense.

II

Our second major objective is effectiveness with economy. Although the American people, throughout their history, have hoped to avoid supporting large military forces, today we must obviously maintain a strong military force to ward off attack, at a moment's notice, by enemies equipped with the most devastating weapons known to modern science. This need for immediate preparedness makes it all the more imperative to see that the Nation maintains effective military forces in the manner imposing the minimum burden on the national economy.

In an organization the size of the Department of Defense, true effectiveness with economy can be attained only by decentralization of operations, under flexible and effective direction and control from the center. I am impressed with the determination of the Secretary of Defense to administer the Department on this basis and to look to the Secretaries of the three military departments as his principal agents for the management and direction of the entire defense enterprise.

Such a system of decentralized operations, however, requires, for sound management, flexible machinery at the top. Unfortunately, this is not wholly possible in the Department of Defense as now established by law. The principal fields of activity are rigidly assigned by law to unwieldy boards which, no matter how much authority may be centralized in their respective chairmen, provide organizational arrangements too slow and too clumsy to serve as effective man-

agement tools for the Secretary. In addition, other staff agencies have been set up in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and their functions prescribed by law, thus making it difficult for the Secretary to adjust his staff arrangements to deal with new problems as they arise, or to provide for flexible cooperation among the several staff agencies.

Accordingly, I am transmitting today to the Congress a reorganization plan which is designed to provide the Secretary of Defense with a more efficient staff organization. The plan calls for the abolition of the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, the Defense Supply Management Agency, and the office of Director of Installations and vests their functions in the Secretary of Defense. At the same time, the plan authorizes the appointment of new Assistant Secretaries of Defense to whom the Secretary of Defense intends to assign the functions now vested in the agencies to be abolished and certain other functions now assigned to other officials. Specifically, the reorganization plan provides for six additional assistant secretaries—three to whom the Secretary will assign the duties now performed by the two Boards—based on a redistribution of staff functions—two who will be utilized to replace individual officials who presently hold other titles, and one to be assigned to a position formerly but no longer filled by an assistant secretary. The new assistant secretary positions are required in order to make it possible to bring executives of the highest type to the Government service and to permit them to operate effectively and with less personnel than at present. In addition, the plan also provides that in view of the importance of authoritative legal opinions and interpretations the office of General Counsel be raised to a statutory position with rank substantially equivalent to that of an assistant secretary.

The abolition of the present statutory staff agencies and the provision of the new assistant secretaries to aid the Secretary of Defense will be the key to the attainment of increased effectiveness at low cost in the Department of Defense. These steps will permit the Secretary to make a thorough reorganization of the nonmilitary staff agencies in his office. He will be able to establish truly effective and vigorous staff units under the leadership of the assistant secretaries. Each assistant secretary will function as a staff head within an assigned field of responsibility.

Without imposing themselves in the direct lines of responsibility and authority between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the three military departments, the Assistant Secretaries of Defense will provide the Secretary with a continuing review of the program of the Defense Establishment and help him institute major improvements in their execution. They will be charged with establishing systems, within their assigned fields, for obtaining complete and accurate information to support recommendations to the Secretary. The Assistant Secretaries will make frequent inspection visits to our far-flung installations and check for the Secretary the

effectiveness and efficiency of operations in their assigned fields.

Other improvements are badly needed in the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense is initiating studies by the three Secretaries of the military departments of the internal organization of their departments with a view toward making those Secretaries truly responsible administrators, thereby obtaining greater effectiveness and attaining economies wherever possible. These studies will apply to the organization of the military departments some of the same principles of clearer lines of accountability which we are applying to the Department of Defense as a whole.

Immediate attention will also be given to studying improvements of those parts of the military departments directly concerned with the procurement and distribution of munitions and supplies and the inventory and accounting systems within each military department. We must take every step toward seeing that our Armed Forces are adequately supplied at all times with the materials essential for them to carry on their operations in the field. Necessary to this effort is a reorganization of supply machinery in the military departments. These studies of the organization of the military departments have my full support.

One other area for improved effectiveness is civilian and military personnel management. In this area certain specialized studies and actions are desirable. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Defense to organize a study of the problems of attracting and holding competent career personnel—civilian and military—in the Department of Defense. As a part of this study, an examination of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and its practical administration will be undertaken to see if any changes are needed. I am directing that this study also include a review of statutes governing the retirement of military officers aimed at eliminating those undesirable provisions which force the early retirement of unusually capable officers who are willing to continue on active service.

The Secretary of Defense, with my approval, is issuing revised orders relating to the preparing and signing of efficiency reports for military personnel who serve full time in the Office of the Secretary, and new instructions to the military departments to guide selection boards in their operations. These actions are aimed at giving full credit to military officers serving in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for their work for the Department of Defense as a whole. Henceforth, civilian officials who have military officers detailed to their offices on a full-time basis will be responsible for filling out and signing the formal efficiency reports for such officers for the period of such service. In the case of officers serving in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, no other efficiency reports for such service will be maintained. The Secretary of each military department is being instructed to direct the boards convened in his department for the selection of military officers for promotion, to give the same weight to service in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the efficiency reports from

that Office as to service in the military department staff and to efficiency reports of departmental officers. These actions are desirable in order to reward military officers equally for service on behalf of the Department of Defense and service on the staff of a military department.

These actions and others which will be undertaken are aimed at a more effective and efficient Department of Defense; indeed, actions toward this objective will be continuous.

The impact of all these measures will be felt through the whole structure of the Department of Defense, its utilization of millions of personnel and billions of dollars. A simple token testimony to this is this fact: In the Office of the Secretary of Defense alone a staff reduction of approximately 500 persons will be effected.

III.

Our third broad objective is to improve our machinery for strategic planning for national security. Certain actions toward this end may be taken administratively to improve the organization and procedures within the Department of Defense. Other changes are incorporated in the reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as provided in the National Security Act of 1947, are not a command body but are the principal military advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. They are responsible for formulating the strategic plans by which the United States will cope with the challenge of any enemy. The three members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who are the military chiefs of their respective services are responsible to their Secretaries for the efficiency of their services and their readiness for war.

These officers are clearly overworked, and steps must be devised to relieve them of time-consuming details of minor importance. They must be encouraged to delegate lesser duties to reliable subordinate individuals and agencies in both the Joint Chiefs of Staff structure and in their military department staffs. One of our aims in making more effective our strategic planning machinery, therefore, is to improve the organization and procedures of the supporting staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff so that the Chiefs, acting as a body, will be better able to perform their roles as strategic planners and military advisers.

Our military plans are based primarily on military factors, but they must also take into account a wider range of policy and economic factors, as well as the latest developments of modern science. Therefore, our second aim in assuring the very best strategic planning is to broaden the degree of active participation of other persons and units at the staff level in the consideration of matters before the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to bring to bear more diversified and expert skills.

The reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress today is designed—without detracting from the military advisory functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a group—to place upon the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

greater responsibility for organizing and directing the subordinate structure of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in such a way as to help the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff discharge their total responsibilities.

Specifically, the reorganization plan makes the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff responsible for managing the work of the Joint Staff and its Director. The Joint Staff is, of course, a study-and-reporting body serving the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The plan makes the service of the Director of the Joint Staff subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense. It also makes the service of officers on the Joint Staff subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These new responsibilities of the Chairman are in consonance with his present functions of serving as the presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, providing agenda for meetings, assisting the Joint Chiefs of Staff to perform their duties as promptly as practicable, and keeping the Secretary of Defense and the President informed of issues before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In addition, the proposed changes will relieve the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a body, of a large amount of administrative detail involved in the management of its subordinate committee and staff structure.

In support of our second aim—broadened participation in strategic planning—the Secretary of Defense will direct the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to arrange for the fullest cooperation of the Joint Staff and the subcommittees of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with other parts of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in the early stages of staff work on any major problem. If necessary, to aid in this additional burden, an Assistant or Deputy Director of the Joint Staff will be designated to give particular attention to this staff collaboration. Thus, at the developmental stages of important staff studies by the subordinate elements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, there will be a proper integration of the views and special skills of the other staff agencies of the Department, such as those responsible for budget, manpower, supply, research, and engineering. This action will assure the presentation of improved staff products to the Joint Chief of Staff for their consideration.

Also special attention will be given to providing for the participation of competent civilian scientists and engineers within the substructure of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Such participants will be able to contribute a wide range of scientific information and knowledge to our strategic planning.

Only by including outstanding civilian experts in the process of strategic planning can our military services bring new weapons rapidly into their established weapons systems, make recommendations with respect to the use of new systems of weapons in the future war plans, and see that the whole range of scientific information and knowledge of fundamental cost factors are taken into account in strategic planning.

Taken together, the changes included in the reorganization plan and the sev-

eral administrative actions should go a long way toward improving the strategic planning machinery of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and lead to the development of plans based on the broadest conception of the overall national interest rather than the particular desires of the individual services.

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations in the Department of Defense.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I have found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of six additional Assistant Secretaries of Defense and a General Counsel of the Department of Defense. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory authority for the exercise of the function of guidance to the Munitions Board in connection with strategic and logistic plans, abolished by section 2 (d) of the reorganization plan, in section 213 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 is expected to result in a more effective, efficient, and economical performance of functions in the Department of Defense. It is impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reduction of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

The Congress is a full partner in actions to strengthen our Military Establishment. Jointly we must carry forward a sound program to keep America strong. The Congress and the President, acting in their proper spheres, must perform their duties to the American people in support of our highest traditions. Should, for any reason, the national military policy become a subject of partisan politics, the only loser would be the American people.

We owe it to all the people to maintain the best Military Establishment we know how to devise. There are none, however, to whom we owe it more than the soldiers, the sailors, the marines, and the airmen in uniform whose lives are pledged to the defense of our freedom.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 6 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, April 30, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SECTION 1. Transfers of functions: (a) All functions of the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, the Defense

Supply Management Agency and the Director of Installations are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) The selection of the Director of the Joint Staff by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and his tenure, shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(c) The selection of the members of the Joint Staff by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and their tenure, shall be subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(d) The functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to managing the Joint Staff and the Director thereof are hereby transferred to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SEC. 2. Abolition of agencies and functions: (a) There are hereby abolished the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, and the Defense Supply Management Agency.

(b) The offices of Chairman of the Munitions Board, Chairman of the Research and Development Board, Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency, Deputy Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency, and Director of Installations are hereby abolished.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall provide for winding up any outstanding affairs of the said abolished agency, boards, and offices, not otherwise provided for in this reorganization plan.

(d) The function of guidance to the Munitions Board in connection with strategic and logistic plans as required by section 213 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby abolished.

SEC. 3. Assistant Secretaries of Defense: Six additional Assistant Secretaries of Defense may be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Defense may from time to time prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 4. General Counsel: The President may appoint from civilian life, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a General Counsel of the Department of Defense who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department, and who shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Defense may from time to time prescribe. He shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 5. Performance of functions: The Secretary of Defense may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Defense of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

SEC. 6. Miscellaneous provisions: (a) The Secretary of Defense may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of Defense of any of the records, property, and personnel affected by this reorganization plan, and such transfers of unexpended balances (available or to be made available for use in connection with any affected function or agency) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department, as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan.

(b) Nothing herein shall affect the compensation of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee (63 Stat. 762).

WELCOME TO DINAH SHORE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasant privilege yesterday to welcome to Washington and as a visitor to the House one of America's most talented artists of stage, screen, radio, and TV, Miss Dinah Shore.

We have all heard plenty from the wrong side of Hollywood, that side which says, "I refuse to testify on the grounds that." The rest of that line is well known to all of us. I am happy to say that Dinah Shore does not belong to that side of Hollywood.

Miss Shore is a native of the great Volunteer State of Tennessee. She is as American as apple pie and as patriotic and loyal as the Fourth of July.

She has given freely of her talents to cheer and entertain our Armed Forces all over the world since Pearl Harbor to Korea.

Commencing with the first United States war savings bond drive in January of 1942, and during every war bond, defense bond, and payroll savings campaign since then, Miss Shore has been in the forefront, freely giving of her time and her talents to help market these important securities which helped us carry on the war effort and build our defenses.

Miss Shore overcame the handicap of polio in her youth to become one of America's great vocal and acting stars. A devoted mother and a faithful and loyal wife to her one and only George Montgomery.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say for the Members of the House of Representatives, welcome to Washington, Dinah Shore. America is proud of you.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to state that Tennessee shares with California her great pride in Dinah Shore. Dinah Shore was born in Franklin County in the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman, and may I say to the gentleman from Tennessee, we were very happy to have had him as a member of the party to greet Miss Dinah Shore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as to the program for the coming week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to respond to the gentleman's inquiry at this time.

On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar. Then, we will take up the rule on the State, Justice, and Commerce

Departments appropriation bill, and after the conclusion of the rule, we will proceed with general debate on the bill. It is probable that we will conclude general debate on Monday and read the first section. We would then be ready on Tuesday to call the Private Calendar as the first order of business, and then read the appropriation bill for amendment.

Wednesday has been set aside for the traditional memorial services in the House Chamber.

On Thursday and Friday we shall continue the reading of the appropriation bill for amendment, if this has not been concluded on Tuesday. We will also undertake to consider H. R. 4465, a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, and the bill (H. R. 4882) to provide the continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes. Both of the latter bills have been reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today on a matter of the most vital importance to us all. The matter to which I refer is the ever-increasing flow of Communist and Socialist propaganda to which the people of this Nation are being subjected with the apparent knowledge and consent of our own Government.

There has been considerable discussion recently to the effect that subversive literature is being smuggled into this country in great quantities. It has been claimed—and is widely accepted as fact—that Communist and Socialist propaganda materials have been brought to the shores of the United States and landed at secluded points with the assistance of residents of our own Nation.

If true—and I am inclined to believe that it is true—this is a situation which should bring forth an immediate increase in our vigilance. For it must be accepted as unquestionable that if those interested in subverting our Government encounter no difficulty in smuggling onto our shores masses of their literature, they can also smuggle into our midst numberless saboteurs.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that to me this is a most disturbing matter. While I am an ardent believer in freedom of speech and freedom of the press, I have never felt that these freedoms should be construed so broadly as to include the freedom to disseminate propaganda

which has as its aim the undermining and ultimate destruction of these very freedoms and of our beloved Nation.

However, much as I am concerned with this influx of propaganda from abroad, I am even more deeply concerned and distressed by the fact that we are permitting to be printed and distributed through the mails some of the most insidious propaganda imaginable. We are permitting this propaganda to be distributed everywhere. My greatest concern is the deliberate and widespread distribution in the schools—an attempt to poison the minds of our youth.

I refer most specifically to the magazine entitled "New Hungary" which is published by the Legation of the Hungarian People's Republic here in Washington, D. C. New Hungary was first brought to my attention by Dr. Harold H. Eibling, who is the superintendent of schools in the city of Canton, Ohio.

Dr. Eibling is not an alarmist—he is not an arch conservative, but he is an outstanding public-school administrator whose long association with youth causes him to recognize the tendency of youth to take at face value that which it sees in print.

What the students in our public schools have seen in the copies of New Hungary sent to their libraries is Socialist propaganda of the rankest kind. It depicts the Hungary of today as a veritable utopia where unemployment is unknown—where almost every young person can expect high school and college education subsidized by the government through scholarships which even include pocket money; where all industry belongs to the people; in short, where all is moonlight and roses.

What New Hungary does not point out is that freedom of choice by the individual is virtually nonexistent; that since the government owns most industry and most farms, in order to have employment the individual must at all times beware of incurring the displeasure of government officials; and that while Hungary boasts of the success of its socialistic system, the people of Hungary have few of those modern conveniences which we take so much for granted in this country.

They boast that several washing machines have been imported from Czechoslovakia. They add that the laundry equipment factory in Hungary has also begun manufacturing washing machines and this year some 100—I repeat—100 of them will be distributed in the villages of Hungary.

As I have said, New Hungary paints only the bright but synthetic side of the picture. However, it does this painting in such brilliant colors that those whose knowledge of the world is rather limited could be very susceptible to its appeal. I am even forced to admit that the new Hungary is depicted so glowingly in this magazine that if I had never read from more factual publications, I would be convinced that in Hungary the millennium has arrived.

But let me quote to you passages from several copies of New Hungary in order that you may judge for yourselves. Remember, these publications are in the libraries of the public schools of this Nation.

I am quoting first from the issue of New Hungary dated February 20, 1952. The lead article in that issue is entitled "A Budget for Peace." Following a general summary of the makeup of the 1952 budget, we find the following statement:

The Minister of Finance pointed out the difference between the surplus in the Hungarian budget and the budgets of the capitalist countries, which always close with heavy deficits. He explained that the secure economy of the Hungarian Government reflects the peaceful, creative construction carried on by the people, while the deficits in the other countries are a result of the war policy of monopoly capital.

After pointing out that Hungary expects a surplus of 205.5 million forints, the article adds that—

Of the expenditures, 61.5 percent will go into the development of the people's economy; 19.4 percent to meet the cultural and social-welfare needs of the people; 14 percent for national defense; and 5.1 percent for miscellaneous purposes.

This allocation of expenditures—

The article concludes—

is proof of the fact that the Hungarian budget is planned for peaceful construction work. Hungary allocates barely one-seventh of her total outlay in 1952 for the People's Army.

What the article does not point out is that Soviet Russia is the military force of this satellite—that Soviet Russia would frown upon a strong Hungarian military force which might someday rise to cast off the yoke of Soviet aggression and domination.

At another point the Minister of Finance is quoted as saying:

Both the structure and content of the 1952 budget indicate the tremendous development of our planned economy. Such development is possible only in a country where socialism is being built.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to think of our young people being subjected to propaganda of this nature. They cannot be expected to understand all the implications of socialism, the manner in which it smothers individual incentive, and its control of the individual. It, therefore, becomes our duty as individuals and as a Government to instruct the youth of this Nation as to the truth of this insidious propaganda.

These socialist propagandists invade even religion. In the same February 1952 issue, New Hungary reports that—

Just before Christmas the Hungarian Protestant churches addressed a message to the Christians of the world, calling upon them to condemn and reject the attitudes of the world financiers who are interested in starting a war and incite hatred among peoples and churches.

New Hungary also quoted Roman Catholic Bishop Endre Hamvas who called upon the faithful to demonstrate their will for peace during the Christmas holidays and on New Year's Eve.

In his Christmas sermon—

The story continues—

he also said that the leaders of the Hungarian people are exerting all their efforts to preserve peace.

It is pleasant to read assurances such as this that Hungary is exerting every effort toward peace. But can these assurances be taken at face value when they emanate from a nation which seeks

to imitate and follow Soviet Russia in every possible way, and which constantly parrots the Kremlin's description of us as "capitalist warmongers"?

If you question the closeness of the relationship between Hungary and Soviet Russia, listen to this statement from the November 1952 issue of New Hungary.

The statement is part of a speech by the Minister of People's Culture at festivities honoring Louis Kossuth, who led the fight for Hungarian independence in 1848. Minister Jozsef Reval declared:

We are solving the tasks of Hungarian industrialization better and more consistently than Louis Kossuth tried to do a century ago, because we are building a national unity not on a nonexistent community of interests between lords and serfs but on the real community of interests that exists among workers, peasants, and intelligentsia.

What Louis Kossuth could only dream of and plan about after the sad experiences of 1848—concerning friendly relations between the Hungarian people and neighboring peoples—is a fact today. During the war of independence, czarist Russia was an ally of the Hapsburgs, who oppressed the Hungarian people. Today the country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism—Stalin's country—is our friend, our support, and our ally.

Take note of that concluding sentence. Let me repeat it: "Today the country of peace, the country building the great structure of communism—Stalin's country—is our friend, our support, and our ally."

Could it be any clearer as to which side Hungary stands with? Obviously Hungary is not on the fence—she is not wavering in such fashion as to give any reason for hope that we can convince her of the righteousness of our cause. This being the case, why should we permit her legation here in our Nation's Capital to publish and distribute, without any effort to refute it, propaganda promoting a cause which has as one of its primary objectives the destruction of our free form of government?

In the January 1953 issue of New Hungary the 1953 budget is discussed. Evidence of the high degree of socialism in Hungary can be found in the statement that 76.1 percent of the Government's total revenues are derived from state-owned enterprises.

Most disturbing of all, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that much of the material in New Hungary is aimed directly at our youth—and let me remind you once again that the magazine is sent to our public schools.

I noted one article in particular in the issue of January 1953. It purports to be the story of the daughter of a working family, who, through the graciousness of the state, is permitted to attend college. The article relates how she immediately begins receiving her monthly scholarship allowance which will continue throughout her 4 years in college. A rapid calculation, the article states, told her that after paying for board and room she would still have money left for those most important things—clothing and entertainment. She immediately sat down and wrote home, as follows:

MY DEAR MOTHER: I have come to a nice place. I have no worries—I must study only. There is someone who helps me, who looks

after me. The state looks after me, the state helps.

Does anyone seriously believe that Amalia, the subject of the above story, would be permitted to express disagreement with any ideas or programs advanced by the state? How long do you think her scholarship would continue if she were to exercise freedom of speech as we do in this country? The history of every totalitarian state tells us that the state, that is, the central government, is always right. The individual who speaks out against it is foolhardy, indeed.

That is why I have always been opposed in principle to Government aid to education. It has been my conviction—and the facts bear me out—that anything the Government supports it also tends to control. Government control over the economy of a nation is bad enough, but Government control over the minds of the youth of a nation is a threat to freedom. Therefore I object very strenuously to having our young people subjected to propaganda which glamorizes Government support and control of education. The possibility that it might sell, even one American youth, on a program which we know is incompatible with our republican form of government is reason enough to condemn it.

I advocate, therefore, that the United States Office of Education advise our high schools and colleges of the true nature and the inherent danger in publications such as *New Hungary*. I think it is time we take a little more practical and hardheaded view of these matters and make it crystal clear to students and general public alike that *New Hungary* and other magazines of its type are deceptive propaganda, the primary purpose of which is to undermine our way of life.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any literature from a Communist country should be plainly labeled as coming from a Communist country. This could be accomplished by a regulation of the Post Office Department.

Would we be permitted to print in Budapest and distribute to the schools of Hungary, without interference, material telling our story?

And if we were permitted to do so, would the Government of Hungary sit by without concern and without attempting to counteract the effects of our publications?

I say it is much more likely that persons who prepared such publications would be thrown in jail, to languish there as Bill Oatis has in neighboring Czechoslovakia.

I am confident that anyone who has followed the activities of the Iron Curtain nations in recent years—and Hungary is one of them—would be forced to admit that we just could not disseminate our information in the same free and easy fashion in which Hungary is permitted to propagandize our people. We remain complacent in the face of something which may threaten our very existence. To date, the only warning I have heard is that issued by Dr. Eibling, and it alone is not enough.

How shall we combat this menace?

Could we attempt to distribute propaganda of our own in nations such as Hungary? Their refusal to permit us to do so would at least spotlight one of the great differences between their form of government and ours.

Could we expand our program to answer the propaganda which they distribute in this country, citing point by point, the inaccuracies, the misrepresentations and the multitude of things which this propaganda does not say?

I do not intend for a moment to give the impression that I have a sure-fire answer to these questions. I do not.

But I am deeply concerned and I think it is high time we get off the shiny seat of our pants, erase the smug expressions from our faces, and show the Iron Curtain nations that we no longer intend to take their reams of subversive propaganda sitting down.

CIVILIAN AIRLINES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for the determination of the policy we pursue in the development of our civilian airlines falls on this Congress. The responsibility for the execution of that policy falls on the Civil Aeronautics Board. Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between the determination of policy and the execution of policy. Sometimes a study of the execution of policy will lead to a change of the policy. Sometimes a study of the execution of policy will reveal that the policy itself is misunderstood or misapplied. Frankly, I do not know just where an examination of the action of the CAB in the case of Pioneer Air Lines may lead us.

Of one thing I am sure. The Board's recent action in refusing to approve the use of modern aircraft by Pioneer, if allowed to stand, will effectively relegate every medium-sized city in the United States which depends in large part on feeder-line air service to perpetual secondhand, second-class air service. I do not believe that this is the policy this Congress intended to outline.

Of one more thing I am sure: We cannot continue to force our feeder-line systems to use obsolete DC-3's without increasing costs and increasing the accident and death rate. As long ago as 1946 the Civil Aeronautics Board itself recognized the dangers of continued reliance on DC-3's and issue an order which the Board itself says would have had the practical effect of eliminating the DC-3's from scheduled passenger service. Although the time limit for compliance with this order was extended to December 31, 1953, and has more recently been indefinitely extended, all of the latent dangers and weaknesses which the Board heretofore observed in DC-3's still exist. These planes become no safer with age. The passage of years does not reduce their operating costs or increase their seating capacity. For a carrier which has developed a high passenger density, whether that carrier be a feeder line or a trunk line, the cost

of operating DC-3's must continue to rise while the revenue per plane cannot rise. Inevitably, therefore, a decision to force the carrier to the use of a predetermined inefficient type of plane must result in ever-increasing subsidy payments by the Government. I do not think this Congress intended that we should follow such a policy.

Only a Member of Congress can bring this story to this House which shares the responsibility for the basic policy. Certainly Pioneer Air Lines is ably represented by its own lawyers, but, after all, the welfare of Pioneer Air Lines is not the issue in this case. It is the welfare of every small- and medium-sized community in America which is in jeopardy. I am the only Representative which 300,000 citizens of central Texas have to present their needs and views. In spite of the fact that Waco, Tex., has long enjoyed trunkline service, there were more than 11,000 passengers who used Pioneer facilities at Waco last year. Temple, Tex., also in my district, and the hospital center of the Southwest, has no other service. Another 11,000 passengers used Pioneer at Temple. These people are entitled to service, and I think they are entitled to first-class service. More than 100 citizens of central Texas have communicated with me on this matter, and have asked me to help them retain the first-class service we have enjoyed. Of course, our business institutions are disturbed. Both houses of the Legislature of Texas has passed strong resolutions deploring this action. I hold in my hand a certified copy of these resolutions. So, my friends, I do not come to you this afternoon to present a plea for Pioneer. Pioneer can speak for itself. I come to you to speak for the people of all America who pay the bill, and particularly the people of the Southwest who are being made to suffer for what I believe to be a misconception of the policy intended by this Congress.

It shall not be my purpose this afternoon to try to abuse any individual or to question the motives of any public official. I have no ill will for the Civil Aeronautics Board or any of its members. This Board and all of its members have always treated me with utmost courtesy. I am sure that each member is seeking to render a service to his country. I question no one's patriotism, honesty, or sincerity. I do, however, feel that this Board has made a grievous mistake in the Pioneer decision. I am inclined to think that that mistake has been predicated on a misunderstanding of the intention of this Congress as it relates to our policy for the development of the civil airlines business. If so, we should take steps to clarify our policy. Possibly what I conceive to be a mistake is only a difference of opinion as to the best method of protecting the American taxpayer. Possibly the Board is right and I am wrong, although I do not think so. In any event, I believe you will agree that the relative merits of the matter should be given to this House. That I propose to do. Since I have no technical knowledge of aviation, I can only speak as a country boy who knows something of the history and of the effects of this decision. I shall try to give you

the facts in the case. You can decide for yourselves if they apply to your section of the country and if you feel that the decision is going to be as dangerous to the taxpayers and to your constituents as I feel it will be to mine.

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts in the Pioneer case? Briefly, they are these: Shortly after the close of World War II, Gen. Robert Smith and Col. Bill Long organized Pioneer Air Lines and in 1945 secured a certificate from the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate a feeder-line service in Texas and New Mexico. This service was, I believe, the first of its kind ever established. It proposed to stop every flight at every city to be served, thus assuring true local or feeder-line service. Pioneer never has, and does not now, fly any through flights; that is, it does not fly over any of its stations, as do all trunkline carriers. The emphasis in Pioneer operations has always been, and still is, on giving the best possible service to the smaller communities that do not receive adequate service from the trunkline carriers. Pioneer has succeeded in this endeavor.

As I have pointed out, I live in a city that is served by one trunkline carrier and by Pioneer Air Lines. The trunkline service is of high quality. It is appreciated and needed, but it does not give the frequency of local service that experience has shown that our city needs and will support. It does not provide any of the greatly needed service to smaller cities in the State which Pioneer provides. Nor has the existence of the feeder-line service impaired the revenues of the trunkline carrier. On the contrary, the trunkline carrier is not only doing more business in Waco than it did before Pioneer came into the picture, but its increase in business has been faster than it has been in comparable communities where it did not have the spur of a local-service carrier. I am told that this is true in every city in the Southwest where Pioneer connects with a trunkline carrier. In other words, Pioneer has proven that it is a real feeder line, as the existence of its service has fed and increased the business of the trunkline carriers.

Pioneer began these operations in August 1945 with 3 small 9-passenger Lockheed Electra planes. Within about a year, Pioneer converted to DC-3's. The DC-3's required an increase in the mail subsidy and this was granted a few months later by the Board in the sum of 45.9 cents per mile.

Although the Board itself began questioning the airworthiness of DC-3's shortly after they were adopted by Pioneer and has on several occasions issued orders which have always been postponed or revoked to the effect that all DC-3's should be eliminated from scheduled passenger service, these planes were operated successfully by Pioneer in such a manner as to materially reduce the subsidy per mile paid by the Government. In fact, for the year ending September 30, 1952, there were only two feeder routes in the entire United States which received smaller mail pay per plane mile than Pioneer Air Lines. Pioneer's mail pay rate was 29.82 cents per plane mile. Operating in the same territory

and out of many of the same terminals, another feeder line received mail pay of 59.34 cents per plane mile and a second competitor received 92.07 cents per mile. No feeder line in the Southwest received less than Pioneer. Certainly these figures show conclusively that Pioneer was prudently managed and efficiently operated.

Approximately a year ago the Pioneer management decided that something must be done to provide more adequate service to the public and to ultimately reduce the cost of the subsidy paid by the Government. Pioneer sought to determine, just as any business institution would, what it could get for its old equipment and what was the best new equipment that it could buy. Pioneer found that it could sell its old 24-passenger, 150-mile-per-hour DC-3's and could purchase nine 36-passenger, 270-mile-per-hour Martin Pacemasters. When a company is making purchases and sales of this kind in a competitive market, it does not have an opportunity to submit either the purchases or the sale to the Civil Aeronautics Board or any other Board for long hearings and discussions. Nor is there any provision of law authorizing such a review. In fact, the Board has consistently refused to pass on a proposed change in equipment. Pioneer borrowed the money and made the deal and the most recent statement of the Civil Aeronautics Board indicates that they recognize that this was an advantageous transaction, by referring to the possibility that "Pioneer may be able to return to DC-3 operation with a profit as a result of its timely sale of its former DC-3 equipment." While this does not seem to me to be a likely contingency, it does, as I see it, prove conclusively that even the Civil Aeronautics Board recognizes that the Pioneer management exercised honest, economical, and efficient management and that is the test laid down by the law. Section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act requires that the Board in determining a carrier's mail pay is to take into account among other factors:

The need of each such air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and, together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense.

Pioneer sought to get some expression from the Board as to its idea as to the desirability of making such a transfer. I have been advised that officials of Pioneer did discuss the matter informally with the then Chairman of the Board and were advised only that the Board could not determine their business policies for them, but that all they had to do was to exercise good business judgment. This they did.

In the past, the Board had followed a policy of encouraging airline carriers to convert from obsolete to more modern equipment and, without exception, as far as I know, the Board has heretofore always approved increased mail pay for

the carriers that have converted. There was a sound reason for this. Practically all of the trunk line carriers were receiving subsidies at the end of the war. They began to convert to more modern equipment. In each case, the conversion resulted in an immediate increase in their costs and therefore in the mail subsidy, but in each case in the course of a very few years, the conversion brought such an increase in business as to reduce and to ultimately eliminate entirely the subsidy paid to the carriers. Today every trunk-line air carrier in the United States has converted to modern equipment and only three are now receiving a mail subsidy. This has saved the taxpayers money. It has improved the service rendered, and it has of course improved the financial condition of the carriers. It was a sound program. It is the only program ever followed by the Civil Aeronautics Board that has ever removed one single carrier from the subsidized list. Pioneer but sought to apply to the feeder lines the same principles of management which have heretofore been successfully applied to the trunkline carriers—the same principles which the Civil Aeronautics Board has repeatedly approved for other carriers. I submit that in the Pioneer case, the Civil Aeronautics Board has intentionally or unintentionally repudiated the only program which it or anyone associated with the airline business has ever suggested as a proven and effective means of reducing the subsidies that the Government is required to pay under law.

To go on with the sequence of events—in June 1952, Pioneer began its Martin Pacemaster service. With these planes, the company was able to provide, and did provide, the type of airline service required by the public and to which the public has become accustomed on other lines for which the Board had approved increased subsidies for conversion such as Continental, Mid-Continent, Braniff, Delta, American, Eastern, and TWA, to name a few of those which operate in the area served by Pioneer. On all of these lines, the Board had approved and had paid for exactly the same kind of conversion that Pioneer made. True; Pioneer was the first feeder line to attempt to give its patrons first-class service, but in doing so, Pioneer did not change its character as a feeder line. It continued to provide local service on every flight to every station on its routes.

Pioneer, of course, immediately applied for an increase in its airmail subsidy. The request would have raised the subsidy from 29.82 cents per plane-mile to 60.8 cents per plane-mile for the year 1953. No one denies that with the operation of the new planes the payment would have been less the following year, and still less the next year. Pioneer estimates that over a 5-year period it would be less than the payment for the use of DC-3's. It was not until March 13, 1953, that the Board handed down an opinion which denied any increase in Pioneer's mail pay. In fact, the decision results in a slight reduction from the amount authorized the previous year for the use of DC-3's.

On March 23, I wrote the Board, asking certain questions which were in the

minds of my people in central Texas. Among the questions I asked was:

Is it the opinion of the Board that DC-3 service is adequate for the cities served by Pioneer, at least for the foreseeable future?

On April 21, 1953, the Board answered my letter and stated:

It is the opinion of the Board that in the foreseeable future Pioneer's 24-passenger DC-3 service appears fully adequate.

And went on to say that this DC-3 service proved adequate not only for Pioneer but for the local service industry in general. There, my friends, you have the statement of the Board clearly showing that it has no intention of giving the smaller cities of America the opportunity to enjoy modern or first-class air service. True, the Board in its next paragraph refers to the excellent safety record of DC-3's. This statement takes on a decidedly defensive character when one remembers that 7 years ago the Board decided that these DC-3's were not safe. Regardless of anybody's decision, common sense dictates that as these planes become older, they must constitute an increasing hazard to life.

In the same letter, I asked the Board if it had any plans to approve the use of another type plane for feeder-line service, and if so, how it contemplated that the operators would be able to finance the change over. The Board replied that it had repeatedly advised the enactment of legislation which would assist in the development of prototype aircraft suitable for the local carrier, and that it thought the return on the investment which the Government provides through mail pay is adequate to attract private investment capital to the scheduled airline industry. It then went on to call my attention to the fact that in years past, many carriers have had considerable success in financing equipment services. In other words, the Board says first that this is the responsibility of Congress. I suppose that implies that we should appropriate more public money to study the question, that we should appoint some more committees, that we should carry on some research to learn as we already know that DC-3's are not adequate for this service. Of course, the Martin planes are not the final word in feeder line planes. We will probably never reach perfection, but the Martins give a far better service than the DC-3's. The Board suggests nothing better than the Martins. It talks of developing entirely new designs. That will take many years. At this rate, the DC-3's would be in service when they are 25 years old. This is just like asking a modern business to use a 1928 model truck or automobile. Can you think of a better formula for bankruptcy?

Then the Board says that the Government subsidy is enough to attract private capital into the business. Of course, carriers in the past have had success in financing their new equipment for the simple reason that in the past the Board has always approved additional payments to help pay for the installation of new equipment, but since this decision has been handed down, I cannot conceive of any of our banking institutions rushing in to supply capital for expen-

sive new equipment which will only earn a return based upon the estimated investment in DC-3's.

I asked the Board how Pioneer was to be expected to convert back to DC-3's, how this shift could be financed, who would buy its Martins, and how it would pay for its new fleet of second-hand DC-3's. To this, the Board, in effect, answers that it has learned that Pioneer can make arrangements for interim financing and continue its operations. How, it does not explain.

The Board has been quoted as saying that if Pioneer does not provide the needed service, the Board will designate some other airline to provide the same service. I, therefore, asked the Board if it knew of any other airline that was willing and able to undertake the service, and if it did not, if it had the power to force some other operator to provide the service. I further asked them if a new operator were placed in Pioneer's position, if it would not cost taxpayers considerably more because of the extra expenses that would necessarily attend the installation of a new operation. The Board did not advise me as to its powers but replied it had come to the conclusion "that Trans-Texas Airways and Central Air Lines, Inc., who operate in the same general area were best qualified to perform this service," that they had been contacted, and that the Board was informed that these carriers could provide the necessary service and that the "Board has prepared to assist these carriers to serve the various communities on Pioneer's route." The Board further estimated that "within a relatively short period of time, the cost of providing the same service by other carriers would not exceed the estimated subsidy mail payment to Pioneer."

The Board has therefore determined that if its actions break Pioneer and force it out of the picture that my section of the country can be adequately and cheaply served by two feeder lines, the most successful of which required and received a subsidy for the operation of DC-3's of almost exactly twice what Pioneer received during its last year for the same planes, and the less successful of which received more than three times as much as did Pioneer for the same service. I would not contend that the people of central Texas have any right to say who shall provide service for our area, but I do insist that the taxpayers of America have a right to insist that they should not be burdened with any such increase in costs with no increase in service. It is true that Pioneer's more modern Martin operation has this past year involved costs which would entitle it to a subsidy of almost exactly as much per plane mile as the more successful of the two lines the Board proposes to put in Pioneer's place—but at least the people are getting improved service, the taxpayers have hope of being relieved of subsidies and, even now, the subsidies asked by Pioneer for Martin operations are no greater than the subsidies being paid to the more successful of these proposed operators for DC-3 operation. I just cannot understand why the Board should want to substitute DC-3's for more modern planes when such a sub-

stitution will not even reduce present costs. But that is not all, the less successful operator to which the Board proposes to give the raiment of the crucified Pioneer is actually costing the Government more than 50 percent more per plane-mile right now with DC-3's than Pioneer asks for the operation of Martins.

Can these existing high-subsidy operators actually be expected to get their costs down to less than 30 cents per plane-mile? That is what the Board says it expects them to do "within a relatively short period of time." If they do this, then it seems to me that the Board has previously erred in giving them approximately 60 cents and 90 cents, respectively, per plane-mile for the operation of DC-3's in the past.

This, my friends, is the history of Pioneer Air Lines' effort to give improved service in the Southwest. Now, unless the Board should completely reverse its position, this must likewise be the end result of every effort anywhere in the United States to improve the service on feeder airlines. It must mean, unless this Congress sees fit to change the situation, that all feeder lines must forever hang as an albatross around the neck of the American taxpayers, that they must expect to live off of the subsidy of the Government and not off of the revenues of sound business. Of course, I know and you know that over a period of years the American people are not going to submit to such a break on progress and such an unnecessary burden on the Treasury. Ultimately, the people are going to demand—and then this Congress is going to demand—that the feeder lines be allowed to do exactly what the trunk lines have been allowed to do, and that is to get onto a basis where the traffic—not the taxpayers—will support their operations, but public opinion is slow to crystalize. It may well take years of poor service and some tragic accidents to the aged DC-3's with a useless toll of human life to bring these changes about through legislation.

In the meantime, most if not all of the efficient feeder-line operators will have passed from the picture. Of course, the inefficient who make no effort to do anything other than to get enough subsidy to live on will be content to rock along eating at the public trough as they have always done. Why should they bother to reduce their costs? So long as they use the sacred DC-3's, the CAB will have the Government make up their deficit. All they need to concern themselves with is that under no circumstances should they put on any new equipment. To do so will condemn them to a reduction in payments and to financial collapse before they have time to reap the rewards of improved facilities.

Clearly, this Pioneer case is not, as many of you had supposed, simply a question of who shall render service in the Southwest. It is not a question of whether a particular feeder line—one of the leaders of the industry though it may be—shall survive. Nor is it simply a question of what service shall many central Texas cities receive. It is a question involving the very existence of the whole feeder line industry in all parts of

our country. It is a question of whether your cities—everybody's cities—shall ever have improved feeder-line service or whether 15-year-old, secondhand, DC-3 service shall be the ne plus ultra. It is a question of whether airline operators shall be encouraged to improve their efficiency or whether they shall be encouraged to drift along living on a never-ending dole.

I am not charging that the Civil Aeronautics Board is deliberately trying to block the hands of progress. In the very beginning, I pointed out that I believe in the honesty and the high intentions of the members of this Board. I still believe in their character and integrity, but I do challenge their judgment. I do not think that they appreciate the importance of the feeder lines. I do not think they realize that this Congress intended for them to encourage, not discourage, improvements in feeder-line service just as they have encouraged improvements in trunk-line service. I think their mistake in this instance is very far-reaching. I think that in their commendable desire to save money this year that they have lost sight of the far greater saving which could and should be effected by encouraging all feeder lines to adopt new and more flexible equipment than the DC-3's which the Board itself so recently condemned. In other words, the Board, as I see it, is penny wise and pound foolish.

I hope that my friends on the Board, and I assure them that they are still my friends, will take a second look and agree that they must help, not hinder, the growth of feeder-line airlines all over America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHAFER, for 4 weeks, on account of appointment to serve as congressional adviser to Department of State at International Rubber Conference at Copenhagen, Denmark.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, for 3 weeks, on account of congressional delegate to World Health Conference.

Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of attendance at World Health Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, until May 25.

Mr. CLARDY, for period May 3 to May 8, inclusive, on account of Un-American Activities Committee hearings at New York City.

Mr. SCHERER, from May 4, through May 8, 1953, on account of hearings of Un-American Activities Committee in the State of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLCOTT (at the request of Mr. TALLE) and to include a letter addressed by the President to Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. AYRES and to include an article.

Mr. NEAL and to include a resolution.

Mr. VORYS in two instances.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in three instances, one on the question of protecting our health, a second on fluoridation of water, and the third on the first 100 days of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. CLARDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include an explanation of a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. PRICE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include a magazine article from Fortune magazine, notwithstanding the fact that the additional cost will amount to \$224.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that the additional cost will amount to \$231.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois).

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. FARRINGTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. McCormack).

Mr. JENKINS in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS and Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) and include extraneous matter at the conclusion of the debate on H. R. 4654.

Mr. PRESTON (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. LYLE) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1767. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The Oath of Office required by the 6th article of the Constitution of the

United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 83d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WILLIAM M. TUCK, 5th District of Virginia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 28, 1953, the following bills were reported on April 29, 1953:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 222. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4465, a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4654, a bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 241. Joint resolution to appoint a committee to attend the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the 1st airplane flight at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted April 30, 1953]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 224. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4882, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4882. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1434. A bill to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers; without amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRUMPACKER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2747. A bill to amend title

17 of the United States Code entitled "Copy-rights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; without amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2566. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder; with amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 340. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLEVENGER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4974. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4925. A bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4926. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the existing authority to receive checks in payment of taxes so as to include authority to receive checks in payment of stamps to be used in payment of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 4928. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4929. A bill to provide for an adequate system of timber access roads to and in the national forests through Treasury loans to the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4930. A bill to exempt from the retailers' excise tax on furs so much of the sales price thereof as does not exceed \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4931. A bill to promote competition by clarifying laws relating to trade regulation and pricing methods or policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4932. A bill to amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to provide that the prescribed markings on imported articles shall be made more clearly visible by the use of contrasting colors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4933. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLELSON:

H. R. 4934. A bill to amend section 117 (j) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4935. A bill to assist in relieving the current immigration and refugee problem by providing for the issuance of 240,000 special immigrant visas during the two fiscal years commencing July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4936. A bill to authorize emergency appropriations for the purpose of erecting certain post office and Federal court buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 4937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from income tax certain amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions or retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 4938. A bill to authorize the improvement of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River, N. H., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 4939. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4940. A bill to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4941. A bill to provide that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may be sued in the same manner as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation may be sued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4942. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4943. A bill to make provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 4944. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4945. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4946. A bill to amend section 10 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 4947. A bill to allow percentage depletion for natural mineral pigments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4948. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to per-

mit the retirement after 25 years' service of certain officers and employees who have incurred disabilities in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 4974. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COON:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution designating the lake to be formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., as Lake Umatilla; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Columbia University in the city of New York, and providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of this anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. Lyman Copeland Draper, author, historian, and collector of American historical books and papers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Res. 225. Resolution extending the felicitations of the House to the Junior Order United American Mechanics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By The SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and study relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii and to make an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw the application to Congress for a constitutional convention and affirming support of United Nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4949. A bill for the relief of Charles Peroulas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4950. A bill for the relief of Harry Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4951. A bill for the relief of Radu R. Florescu and Mrs. Nicole Michel Florescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4952. A bill for the relief of Vinicio Soto Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Henry Hauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 4954. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Chambers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 4955. A bill for the relief of Hans Ella Hillers Tromholt, Mrs. Edna Emma Tromholt, Frank Norris Tromholt, Elsa Maria Tromholt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4956. A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Spilingaard, Helen Colette Spilingaard and Renee Anne Spilingaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4957. A bill for the relief of Barbara Maude Stamat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4958. A bill for the relief of the estate of Martin A. Gleason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 4959. A bill for the relief of Muhittin Schuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Nathan Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4961. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4962. A bill for the relief of Jacquelin Rahal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4963. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Nowicka and her daughter, Irena Nowicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4964. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Francis Friedmann, Sara Friedmann, Cipore Malke Friedmann, and Gizela (Gitla) Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4965. A bill for the relief of Gong Poy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4966. A bill for the relief of Angelo Antonio Cantisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Ervin Benedikt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4968. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Okun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Philip G. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Clappis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 4973. A bill for the relief of John F. Biba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

210. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the River Rouge, Mich., Kiwanis Club urging

enactment of legislation providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

211. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Central-Northwest Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., relative to the District of Columbia Veterans' Service Center; to the Committee on Appropriations.

212. Also, petition of the secretary, District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Washington, D. C., relative to the District of Columbia Veterans' Service Center; to the Committee on Appropriations.

213. Also, petition of Mrs. H. W. Lingle and others, of Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

214. Also, petition of J. W. Yopp and others, New Smyrna, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

215. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Nutting and others, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

216. Also, petition of Moki Toyota and 300 others, Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.